

The Reformed Church Review

Volume 3

APRIL, 1924

Number 2

In Memoriam

JAMES I. GOOD, D.D., LL.D.

1850-1924

I

THE PASSING OF THE REVEREND JAMES I.
GOOD, D.D., LL.D.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS

Dr. Good was a notable figure, not only in the Reformed Church, but in American and European Protestantism. Few men of the American Church were more widely, and in many respects, more favorably known in Europe than he. At the meeting of the Alliance of Reformed Churches at Pittsburgh in 1921, Prof. M. A. Curtis of Scotland, in reporting for the Eastern Section of the Alliance, said: "I do not think that since the days of Dr. Schaff, and to go even further back, since the days of John Dury, the old apostle of Church Unity for Scotland, there has been a Presbyterian friend to our weak and threatened churches compared to Professor Good of Philadelphia." This position among the churches of the world he won for himself by a life-time of Christian fellowship and unstinted work. He lived an extraordinary life which well deserves analysis and study.

The salient facts of his life may readily be told; but of greater interest and significance are its spirit and purpose.

Dr. Good came from a family engaged in educational and ministerial work. His father was a principal of a select school for girls and minister of several Reformed congregations in the vicinity of Reading, Pa. Later he was elected the first superintendent of public schools of Berks County. His two uncles—Jeremiah H. and Reuben Good—were also ministers of the Reformed Church and served as professors in Heidelberg College and Theological Seminary at Tiffin, Ohio. By birth and nurture, he was a child of the Reformed Church in the U. S., and to that Church he gave himself unreservedly throughout his life. Through that Church, also, he coöperated with other Reformed and Presbyterian Churches throughout the world in works of mercy on two continents.

Dr. Good received his higher education in Lafayette College, where he graduated in 1872, and in Union Theological Seminary, New York; completing his course in 1875. Later in life he was given the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity both from Ursinus and Lafayette College, and of Doctor of Laws from Ursinus College. He was licensed for the ministry by Lebanon Classis in 1875. He spent thirty years in the active pastorate, serving as minister of Heidelberg Church, York, Pa., 1875-7; Heidelberg Church, Philadelphia, Pa., 1877-90, and Calvary Church, Reading, Pa., 1890-1905.

During most of this time he was a close student of the history of the Reformed Church; and during his pastorate in Reading he was Professor of Church History, 1890-1903, Professor of Dogmatics and Practical Theology, and Dean of Ursinus School of Theology, 1903-7. After he gave up his ministry in Calvary Church, Reading, he devoted all his time to historical research, teaching, missions, preaching, lecturing at large, and serving as chairman of the commission of the Western Section of the Alliance for the aid of the Reformed Churches in Europe. He was chosen president of the Board of Foreign Missions in 1893, con-

tinuing in that office until 1924, to the day of his death. In the words of the Secretary of the Board, Dr. Bartholomew, "he had not served any apprenticeship as a member of the Board, but at its very first meeting, after his election by the General Synod in the year 1893, we chose him as our president."

He was, also, elected president of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in the U. S. in 1911-14; president of the American Section of the Alliance of Reformed Churches, and vice president of the Alliance of Reformed Churches which met in Pittsburgh in 1921. In his later years he was one of the delegates of the Reformed Church in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

In recognition of his beneficent services for the congregations, ministers, students and schools of the Reformed Church in Hungary, he was elected as an honorary Professor in the Theological Seminary of Pápa. After his death the following memorial was drawn up and sent to the Reformed Church in the U. S. by the Faculty of Pápa:

"Under the Hope of a Happy Resurrection

"The Seminary of Pápa of the Trans-Danubian Synod with sad heart wishes to convey their condolences:

"Their Honorary Professor in the Theological School,

Dr. James I. Good,

died peacefully in the Lord in his 75th year at Philadelphia on January 21st, 1924. In trying times he was our faithful friend. With deep love in his heart he felt our sufferings, and like a sunbeam from a mystic world attempted to warm us up. With pen and word, through work and prayers, he struggled for the Magyar Reformed Church. It was indeed a glad day for him when he did something for us. His face lit up with radiant smiles when he was among us, or heard good news of us. His countenance is engraved on our hearts forever. We bless God for sending this great servant to us. His spirit will live with us forever.

"Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; for their works follow with them."—Rev. 14:13.

Dr. Good was a prolific writer. He always wrote upon one subject though with many variations—the history of the Reformed Church—the Reformed Church in Europe (Switzerland, Germany and France) and the Reformed Church in the U. S. Besides many books, which bear the imprint of his name, he published scores of articles in weekly, monthly, and quarterly periodicals. Written in popular style they were none the less scholarly, usually containing new historical facts and data which he discovered through patient research in the libraries or book-shops of Europe and America. The list of books, which is given on the title page of his last published work, is as follows: "Origin of the Reformed Church of Germany," "History of the Reformed Church of Germany," "History of the Reformed Church in the United States," "History of the Reformed Church in the United States in the Nineteenth Century," "Famous Women of the Reformed Church," "Famous Missionaries of the Reformed Church," "Famous Places of the Reformed Churches," "History of the Swiss Reformed Church Since the Reformation." This, however, is not a complete list of his publications, some of which were in pamphlets, yet of sufficient length and weight to be classed as books.

Dr. Good was an incessant traveller. He went to Europe for the first time in 1879 where he was bent upon finding information about his ancestors who came from Coblenz, Germany. This visit not only brought him in close touch with his forbears in Europe but awoke in him an undying interest in the history of the Reformed Church. For afterwards he crossed the Atlantic, with few exceptions, every summer—twenty-six times in all. After he was president of the Foreign Mission Board he visited the Missions of the Reformed Church in Japan and China and journeyed around

the world. In all his travels he was not a time-passing tourist of the popular sort, but a close observer of conditions social, political, and religious, and in constant contact with men engaged in educational and religious work. His conversations and addresses were enriched by anecdotes and reminiscences drawn from his world-wide knowledge of men and affairs.

We find the secret of Dr. Good's life in his absolute devotion to a single purpose which controlled all his activities. The purpose was to do all he could and to give all he had for the work of Christ through his Church. He did many things and yet there was unity in the diversity of his works—the purpose of the advancement of God's kingdom and the corresponding welfare of his fellowmen. He travelled often, but never for mere pleasure—always for historical investigation, for preaching, for benevolent work. He had pleasure in life but not the pleasure of the globetrotter or the indulgent summer tourist; his was the pleasure that comes from the fulfillment of a noble aim, that is attained in the uplift of men and in the glory of God. He never seemed to be in a hurry; indeed, a man of his build might be inclined to a life of ease, but the immense amount of work which he accomplished proves him to have been an indefatigable toiler. His work among the churches alone would have been enough for an ordinary man; but in addition to this he had an immense correspondence which covered Europe and America, all written with his own hand. The books he wrote and published would have taken all the time of most men.

From his parents Dr. Good received an ample inheritance, sufficient to relieve him from dependence on his annual salary. He was free also from the responsibilities and the cares of a family. All this might have induced him to live a life of luxurious ease; and still be a respectable minister of the gospel. On the contrary, notwithstanding the advantages he had through the possession of wealth or freedom

from care, he gave himself all the more completely to the pursuit of his supreme purpose—the service of God and men. He lived economically in dress, food, and modes of travel, not to add to his wealth but to enrich others and to minister to those who were in need. He stands out as a shining example among the ministers of his time—one whom all those who lived with him and all who come after him may well emulate.

JAMES I. GOOD**GEORGE L. OMWAKE**

The first impulse on speaking of Doctor Good is to give expression to the genuine feeling of sorrow that is in every heart. This sense of sorrow is not because of any worldly obligations left unfilled, not because of any dependents left helpless, not because of important work left undone. He had lived out the full round of life, and as he sought temporal rest at the end of his last day on earth—a day spent in the service of Christ and the Church, he entered into eternal rest. From the earthly viewpoint, the manner of his death was almost ideal. And so it is not from sympathy engendered by any physical suffering of the departed that we must be sorrowful. The feeling which wells in every mourner's breast is subjective. It arises out of a keen sense of personal loss. For Doctor Good was a real minister and all who came within the scope of his acquaintance benefited therefrom. A great Christian friend and benefactor has gone from among us.

But the grief which we bear is somehow glorified. The sorrow which we feel has a warmth which makes it not uncomfortable. The afterglow of the sunset carries over into the dawn of the morning. What life was ever a more inspiring testimony to the Christian faith! So dominant was the note of triumphant faith in all his thoughts and deeds, that in the very shadow of death there beams from

above the light of the eternal day. When we think of him we perforce must think not of death but of *life*. Yea, as if from his very voice, we hear the declaration of our Lord, in whom was his abiding faith, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." We are made to feel not that we are under the command of inexorable death but that we are under the challenge of infinite and eternal life.

Under this challenge, we turn to that field of activity in the life of Doctor Good wherein he served as a student among students. A student he never ceased to be and students he never ceased to love. His heroes in the field of Church History were students and scholars. He looked upon the lives of these great characters so steadily and fondly, that like the lad in Hawthorne's tale of the Great Stone Face, he grew into their likeness. As we recall his figure sitting in repose in any recent ecclesiastical gathering it requires no impossible stretch of imagination to see the typical scholar of Reformation days. Thus he worked in an atmosphere that inspired his best effort and under an example that encouraged painstaking labor. To confirm a single point might require a trip to Europe and weeks of search in some unfrequented library, and it is well known that at great personal effort and expense he made the Church forever his debtor in bringing to light much of her important history. It was sometimes said of him that he studied with a prejudice and wrote with a bias. But this was not true except in the sense that it is true of any writer. All who interpret truth do so in the light of their own inner and purely personal experience. Each sees what he has by previous experience been prepared to see. Thus it is possible for the most candid historians to see different meanings in the same event. The fact that one jealously maintains and defends a position is only a proof of his conviction. But Doctor Good, especially in his later years, was generously tolerant of views divergent from his own, and this is the mark of a truly great scholar.

In teaching he employed a pedagogical method that had the merit of being old fashioned. He discussed the lesson before his class as one who knew. He assumed the position of one who was an authority, and therefore he was didactical. Frequently he resorted to dictation in which case it were well for the student to take careful notes. But it was never difficult to get his meaning. He never presumed unduly on the previous knowledge of the learner, and so he taught at the risk of employing a too simple and elementary style. His vast store of facts and his wide and intimate knowledge of persons and places enabled him to illuminate his teaching with personal experience and anecdote, and so the class hour never dragged. He was quite up to date in his use of maps, pictures and curios in the teaching of history. By means of the stereopticon he made even remote church history interesting to popular audiences as thousands of people throughout our churches in city and country alike can testify.

It can be said of Doctor Good, that, however interested he may have been in the subject matter of his instruction his dominant interest was in his students. His heart was fixed not on facts but on men. In his ministry as a pastor it was his highest joy to win men for Christ. In his ministry as a teacher, his highest joy was found in the further step of winning men for life service as ministers or missionaries. Perhaps more men are in the service of the Church to-day because of his influence and effort than can be placed to the credit of any other one individual.

To Doctor Good, college life was congenial. In the earlier years of his teaching, he seemed oppressively serious and most students felt somewhat diffident toward him. But during his more than three decades as a professor in Ursinus College, he accomplished a complete transformation in this respect. In the latter years no sooner was he on the campus than there were students around him. He told stories, joked with them, laughed with them and enjoyed their

presence about him. But by this, he lost nothing in respect and greatly gained in influence over them. His genial and companionable attitude toward college students was seen at its best when he sat at the head of the banquet table at the annual dinner which he gave to the boys of the Brotherhood of Saint Paul, the body of ministerial students in Ursinus College. He always called in a few clerical friends and the President of the College to share his hospitality and his happiness on these occasions. Through more than a dozen years we thus saw the bonds of affection between the good Doctor and the boys of the Brotherhood strengthened and held tight.

Now he is gone from us, but his influence in moulding the life of the growing college, like his influence in the Church and in the wider Kingdom of God on earth, is permanent. The fruits of his labors will endure unto coming generations. As his memory takes final resting place in our hearts, we may well write in the refrain of Saint Paul:

“Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

“Thanks be to God which always causeth us to triumph in Christ.

“Thanks be to God which put the same earnest care in the heart of his servant.

“Thanks be to God for his unspeakable gift.”

URSINUS COLLEGE,
COLLEGEVILLE, PA.

II

THE TREND OF PSYCHOLOGY

RAY H. DOTTERER

Psychology, in the modern sense of the term, is a very new science. Scientific psychology, indeed, is still in its infancy. The *word* psychology appears to have been first used by Goclenius, a professor at Marburg in 1590 as the title of one of his works. Eucken, it is true, says in his *Geschichte der philosophischen Terminologie*, that Melanchthon had employed the word as a lecture-heading; but Lalande, a recent French investigator, has been unable to verify this assertion. In the seventeenth century and even in the eighteenth century, despite the work of Hume, Condillac, and others upon the problem of the formation of ideas, the word was rarely used. Christian Wolff, however, the systematizer of the Leibnitzian philosophy, published his *psychologia empirica* in 1732, and his *psychologia rationalis* in 1734. His example was followed by Kant, and the term thus obtained wide currency. It became very usual in France, thanks to its employment by Maine de Biran and Victor Cousin. Indeed, the Eclectics made psychology one of the four grand divisions of the field of instruction. Nevertheless psychology remained intimately united with philosophy. And, accordingly, when Auguste Comte rejected the eclectic philosophy he discarded the word psychology also. However, for him it was not a mere question of the use of words; for he did not admit the possibility of a science of the spirit which should subsist by itself, with its own peculiar principles, distinct at once from biology and sociology. Thus in Comte's famous "hierarchy of the sciences," psychology nowhere appears.

¹ Lelande, *Traite de Psychologie*, p. 1.

² *Ibid.*, p. 2.

Yet, great as has been the influence of Comte, in this respect science did not follow the course traced for it by the master. On the contrary, psychology reappears. In the nineteenth century, its history is dominated by two tendencies, which are sometimes allied and sometimes opposed to each other. The first of these is the effort of psychology to separate itself from philosophy and to become a special science; the second is the effort to find for psychology a field, methods, and principles which will differentiate it, not only from philosophy, but also from other special sciences, such as physics and physiology, with each of which it obviously has much in common. Under one form or another this "independent psychology" developed with extraordinary rapidity. 1878, Wundt established the first laboratory of experimental psychology at Leipzig. These psychological laboratories subsequently multiplied rapidly, especially in Germany and America.³

Before entering, however, upon a discussion of recent and contemporary psychology, two points of view, long since transcended, but both immensely influential in their day, and neither wholly without influence even now, should be noticed. One of these is the point of view of the "faculty psychology," and the other that of "associationism." According to the faculty theory the mind is thought of as divided into compartments—faculties or powers—which are regarded as independent forces. Sensation, memory, reason, judgment, will, etc., are supposed to produce the phenomena which fall under these heads. Thus "we see because we have a faculty of sensation, we think by means of our thought faculty, we act by virtue of the fact that our will is an independent faculty which is free from the restraints of physical causation."⁴ According to modern psychology, however, sensation, reason, etc., are merely convenient class-names, not causes or forces, and "we have no more justification for

³ *Ibid.*, p. 3ff.

⁴ Moore, Jared Sparks, *Foundations of Psychology*, p. 12.

thinking of the faculty of perception, for example, as causing or producing individual perceptions than we have for thinking of the idea of 'man' as causing or producing individual men."⁵

Associationism is a typically British School of psychology, founded in the eighteenth century by David Hume and David Hartley. The associationist theory implies that every idea, in the Lockean sense of the term, is an independent, more or less permanent, and revivable reality. It then teaches that every idea is endowed with the power of association with other ideas, so that when one member of a group is revived the others are revived with it. Thus, by virtue of the principle of association, complex mental states are built up by combining elementary ideas. Modern psychology, however, while recognizing association as a *fact*, refuses to accept it as a principle of explanation. The "laws of association," considered as principles of explanation, belong to what Comte calls the *metaphysical* rather than the *positive* stage of science. Again ideas are not permanent entities; they are rather passing phases of mental life. We have no more ground for supposing that an idea exists when we are not thinking of it, than for imagining that the music of the Victrola record exists while some other record is being "played."

Let us not suppose, however, that psychology, having vindicated its right to be a science independent of philosophy, and having sloughed off the faculty theory and associationism, has now at length reached a state of stable equilibrium. On the contrary, the twentieth century is witnessing a rapid development in subject-matter and in point of view. If, then, we are to characterize the trend of contemporary psychology by a set of contrasted phrases, we may say that it has changed or is now in process of transition (1) from a science of the soul to a science of behavior; (2) from a subjective science with introspection as its peculiar method

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

to a science of objective observation and experiment; (3) from a science primarily concerned with structure to a science primarily concerned with function; (4) in its physiological aspect, from a study of brain and nervous system to a study of the entire physical organism; (5) from a science exclusively concerned with man to a science of animal behavior in general; and (6) so far as contemporary psychology is concerned at all with problems of a philosophical nature, it has passed, or is passing from dualism by way of parallelism to neutral monism, or else to epiphenomenalism. These six contrasts are by no means exhaustive, neither are they strictly independent; but it will be convenient to discuss each of them in turn.

1. In the first place, then, we say that psychology has changed from the science of the soul to the science of behavior. On etymological grounds, one might of course argue that psychology, so long as it retains the name, must always remain the science of the soul. But it is usage rather than etymology which determines the meaning of words, and to discover what psychology is at the present time we must look between the covers of contemporary books on psychology and observe what is going on within the walls of psychological laboratories. The present-day psychologist is unwilling to call his science the science of the soul, because he feels that it is unscientific to commit himself in advance of inquiry to the acceptance of a metaphysical concept. Moreover the word 'soul,' in the course of its long history, has picked up too many associates. It is too ambiguous. By those who have sought to discard the word 'soul,' psychology has sometimes been defined as the science of 'mind' or of 'consciousness.' But these definitions, too, have been found unsatisfactory. And a witticism has gone the rounds to the effect that psychology long ago lost its soul, and now in these latter days has lost its mind also. We might add that psychology now appears to be losing consciousness; for it is difficult to attach any satisfactory mean-

ing to the phrase 'science of consciousness.' We can readily attach meaning to the *adjective* 'conscious,' but the *noun consciousness* is harder to interpret. For a person may of course be conscious at one time and unconscious at another; or at a given moment he may be conscious of one object and unconscious of another. But when we speak of the person's state of consciousness or of his consciousness of an object, do we mean to take consciousness as a thing, an entity, a substance? Or is it merely an abstraction, like whiteness or triangularity, a mental construct which has no independent existence? For the Platonist, indeed, what we call *abstract* in the *really real*. It is logically prior to its particular manifestations. Thus according to the Platonist, the snow is white because it "participates in whiteness"; the young man is beautiful because he "participates in beauty." But statements such as these leave us moderns cold. We prefer to think of whiteness and beauty as abstract concepts which derive all their meaning from the concrete facts of our experience. Unless we are willing, then, to adopt the Platonic doctrine of universals, while conscious states, or conscious forms of behavior may be objects of scientific investigation, *consciousness* can not. As long as psychology continues to employ concepts like 'soul' or 'mind' or '*consciousness*' as *principles of explanation*, it is still in the metaphysical stage. Only as it deals with facts which can be experimentally verified, does it reach the plane of a genuine science.

2. This change from science of the soul to science of behavior is accompanied by a change in method. The older psychology employed the method of introspection. In other words, it attempted to study the facts of mental life by a method different from that of objective observation. John Locke, it will be remembered, recognized two sources of knowledge. All knowledge, he said, comes from experience; but there are two kinds of experience. These are sensation and reflection, or the *outer sense* and the *inner sense*. Just

as the outer sense gives us information concerning the world of material objects, so the inner sense gives us information concerning the processes of our own minds. Thus by introspection I know the meaning of anger, of pain, of the difference between memory, let us say, and sense-perception.

In contemporary psychology, however, there is a disposition to disparage the introspectionist method. For (1) the attempt to introspect a given experience modifies the experience. Thus anger evaporates if you stop to ask yourself what it feels like to be angry. And (2) the data of introspection do not lend themselves to measurement. It is hard to give them a quantitative expression. And all laboratory science aspires to be quantitative, to be mathematical. Accordingly, in opposition to the introspectionist school, there has grown up a school of "objective" psychologists. They maintain that if psychology is to be a science its facts must be ascertained in the same way as the facts of physics or chemistry. Psychology must develop a laboratory technique like that of the other sciences. It must count and weigh and measure. And the things which can be measured, weighed, and counted, are things like bodily movements and changes in the amount and chemical content of secretions. Phenomena such as these are more and more coming to be regarded as the proper subject-matter for the attention of the psychologist.

Thus the psychologist may measure 'reaction-time.' By this is meant the time which elapses between stimulus and response. For example, the experimenter may direct his subject to press a certain button the instant he sees a pre-arranged signal. It is then possible by mechanical means to measure the time which elapses between signal and response with a high degree of accuracy. Again, the psychologist may analyze samples of the blood or of other body fluids to discover the modifications of the secretions produced by fear, anger, or some other emotional state.

3. There has been a shift from the point of view of struc-

ture to the point of view of function. The distinction between these points of view may be readily grasped, if we will recall the familiar distinction between *anatomy* and *physiology*. Anatomy is concerned with the structure of the organism. Physiology studies the use, work, or function of the various organs. Anatomy is possible without physiology, but physiology presupposes anatomy. The older psychology aimed to be an *anatomy* or *morphology* of the mind. It studied mental *states* or mental contents, taking some momentary state of consciousness and analyzing it into its constituents; or reversing this procedure, it showed how certain elementary contents combine to form the more complex contents with which experience is ordinarily concerned. The newer psychology views the mind from the standpoint of function. It regards psychology as a science of processes rather than of states. Its fundamental concept is that of *reaction*. A human being is thought of as a very complicated machine, which so to speak, is played upon by elements of the environment which are known as stimuli. One of the pioneers in the functional point of view was Herbert Spencer. We remember, of course, his famous definition of life: *the adjustment of inner relations to outer relations*. When an organism ceases to make these adjustments it is dead; as long as it makes them it is alive. Psychology, then, is the study of these adjustments so far as they are dependent upon mind, or, shall we say, upon the nervous system. The sum-total of these adjustments or responses may be called the *behavior* of the organism. The more radical functionalists, accordingly, have chosen to call themselves *behaviorists*.

Extreme behaviorism would limit behavior to such reactions as are objectively observable. For this radical school, as we have seen, the typical data of psychology are the movements of muscle and the modifications of secretion. There is, however, an obvious objection to the position of the radical behaviorist. He refuses to admit the notion of consciousness into his scheme; but if psychology is to be

the study of behavior, that is to say, of reactions or adjustments, and is to take no account whatsoever of the notion of consciousness, how shall the line be drawn between psychology and physiology? Are digestion and respiration to be included in the category of behavior; and do they fall within the scope of psychology? As a matter of fact the "behaviorist" usually studies much the same aspects of behavior as have interested the more conventional psychologist. But why he should limit himself in this manner is not at all clear. There is, however, a more moderate behavioristic doctrine which also defines psychology as the science of behavior, but broadens the concept of behavior so as to include changes in consciousness as well as changes in body.

The behavioristic point of view is the one which seems most likely to lead to worth-while applications. For when we study psychology as an applied science what we want to know is how we may achieve control. Each one wishes to learn to control himself, and to control others. We wish to learn what must be done to assure the desired behavior. The behaviorists' statement of the problem as an investigation of the relation of situation to response is likely, then, to become increasingly influential; whatever we may think of the philosophical implications of behaviorism.

4. Psychology, in its physiological aspects, instead of centering its interest in the brain and the nervous system, now studies the entire organism. There is less disposition than formerly to identify mind with brain. The phrenological point of view, in accordance with which the various faculties or powers of mind were assigned to certain convolutions of the brain, which were then considered as organs of these various faculties, has been discarded. One reason for the repudiation of phrenology is the decline of the "faculty theory." It no longer seems plausible to isolate "combativeness," "philoprogenitiveness," "approbative ness," "number," and the rest of a rather miscellaneous

assortment, and to treat them as mental faculties. In the second place, the whole conception of "centers" in the brain has been losing ground. Experimenters have, it is true, had some success in the localization of function in the cortex—which by the way does not agree at all closely with the phrenologist's map of the brain;—but these regions should not be regarded as "centers" each one the seat of a distinct faculty of the soul. Rather should they be regarded as regions through which pass the lines of communication connecting various parts of the organism.

The dominant conception in contemporary physiological psychology is not that of the brain-center, but rather that of the reflex arc. The reflex arc, called also "reaction arc" or "sensori-motor circuit," is the pathway from sense-organ to muscle or gland. Each reflex arc consists of two or more neurones, that is to say, nerve-cells with their branches. Over this pathway the nervous disturbance passes from the sense organ to a muscle which thereupon contracts, or to a gland where there is produced some change in the quality or amount of secretion. When the pathway of the disturbance passes through the spinal cord and thence directly to the muscles without reaching the brain, we have "reflex action," in the ordinary sense. In a wider sense, however, all action is reflex, inasmuch as it is a response to stimuli producing nerve-disturbances which pass over a system of reflex arcs. What we know as "voluntary" behavior results when the reflex arcs pass through the cortex of the cerebrum. Any idea whatsoever, any psychic event, is (or is the correlate of) a nerve "current" in a system of reflex arcs.

5. In contemporary psychology, much time is being devoted to the study of animal behavior. Our more or less distant relatives the dog, the cat, the white rat, and many others, are being subjected to experiment and observation. Study of animal behavior would, of course, have value for its own sake; but it is also studied in the expectation that it will throw some light upon the problems of human

psychology. It is assumed that the laws of behavior which are discovered for animals will also hold true, at least in a general way, for man.

Interest in this field is largely due, historically, to the influence of Darwin, Romanes, C. Lloyd Morgan, and the host of naturalists who studied the problem of animal behavior after the advent of the theory of evolution. Professor Walter S. Hunter distinguishes "three chief methods of studying animal behavior: (1) the naturalistic method, or method of field observation; (2) the method of general response; and (3) the method of selective response. The first method was used practically by the naturalists of Darwin's day. It is still used for practically the same purpose, viz., for the observation of the animal in his own habitat, unmolested by experimental conditions. The studies in this field of work cover such topics as the "expression of emotions" in animals (Darwin) and the general observations on instincts, such as migration, mating, homing, and fighting (Romanes, Morgan, Watson, and innumerable others). This method has its chief value for psychology in that it suggests many problems for accurate study. . . . If a vulture approaches a heap of carrion, or if an owl catches a mouse, field observation can record the fact, but it cannot tell what sense-organs are involved. Did the vulture smell or see his food? Did the owl see, hear, or smell the mouse? Only careful experiments upon the sensitivity of the animals concerned can give the answer."⁶

"The method of general response applies typically to those cases in which the experimenter confronts an animal with a certain stimulus or object and notes its general, untutored, native response. Francis Galton was a prominent pioneer in the use of this method. Going thru the zoölogical gardens of London, he sounded high-pitched notes on a whistle, which he carried concealed in his hand, near various species of animals. If the animal tested responded with any move-

⁶ Hunter, W. S., *General Psychology*, pp. 15f.

ments, Galton concluded that it could hear the tone in question. When carefully applied this method gives conclusive results on the question of mere sensitivity, but it is not so safe where discriminations between objects are involved. Unless, for example, the experimenter can secure one kind of response to sound and another kind to light, there is no way of telling whether or not these forms of stimulation are different for the animal. Work on general response has been done particularly in studies of hearing, smell, and taste in fish."⁷

"The most important form of this method," continues Professor Hunter, "is that of *conditioned reflexes* perfected by Pawlow and von Bechterew. It has been used successfully in this country by Watson and his students, both on man and animals. The essential features of the procedure are as follows: Certain stimuli will without training arouse motor and glandular activities, e.g., taste will arouse a flow of saliva; increased light intensity will cause a contraction of the pupil of the eye; and pain will produce a withdrawal of the part of the body injured. These are *unconditioned reflexes*. Certain other stimuli which do not naturally arouse the response will finally come to do so if they are associated frequently with the effective stimuli."⁸ The classic experiment on the conditioned reflex was Pawlow's experiment on the dog. When food is presented to the dog there is a flow of saliva. Pawlow rang a bell each time the food was presented. After a while, when the bell was rung in the absence of the food, there would be a flow of saliva. Thus one stimulus is substituted for another. This principle of *substitute stimulus* is of exceeding importance in contemporary psychology, as it enters into the explanation of a great many phenomena of learning or practice.

"The third method—selective response—is the most widely used behavior method among psychologists. . . .

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

The animal is taught to associate certain objects—colors, sounds, etc.—with movements of its entire body. For example, it may learn to open a box or to run through a maze when placed near or in such an apparatus. In these instances the fundamental motives employed are hunger and the avoidance of pain.”⁹ When the animal is successful, it is fed. Electric shocks usually serve for the punishments and are given when errors are made.

Very interesting studies have been made, in the case of both animals and children, of what is known as the “delayed reaction.” The animal has been trained to react to a certain stimulus. The problem is to discover how long the tendency to react will continue after the stimulus has ceased. “The delayed reaction has been studied with rats, dogs, cats, raccoons, and children. . . . The method of procedure is as follows: An animal is placed in the release box; a light can be turned on in either of three boxes; the animal’s exit from the apparatus is blocked save through the lighted box. When the animal is released it must learn to go thru the box which is lighted.” Only thus can it obtain the food. “When once the animal has perfected this association of light and food, the real problem begins. The experimenter then places the animal in the release box; turns on the light in some one of the three boxes; when the animal has seen the light, turns it off; keeps the animal in the release box for a certain interval of time; and finally releases it. Will it go out the box that was most recently lighted? If this is the case, the period of delay is increased, until the limit of the animal’s ability is reached. The maximal intervals of successful delay obtained in this problem are as follows:

Rats	1 to 5 seconds
Dogs	1 to 3 minutes
Raccoons	10 to 25 seconds
Cats	16 to 18 seconds
Child 1½ yrs.....	20 seconds
Child 2½ yrs.....	50 seconds
Child 5 yrs.....	At least 20 minutes. ¹⁰

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 31ff.

6. We have said that psychology seems to be passing from dualism by way of parallelism to neutral monism or epiphenomenalism. We are constrained to ask, are mind and body different entities, or are they aspects of the same? Psychology, as a special science, need not answer this question. Nevertheless the average psychologist is still too much of a philosopher to resist the temptation to indulge in some speculation. The older psychology was, for the most part, dualistic. Dualism holds that mind and body are two distinct substances, and usually adds that they interact. Bodily changes cause mental changes, and mental changes cause bodily changes. Dualists have been perplexed, however, to explain *how* mind and body can interact. The reasons for this perplexity are (1) the unlikeness of mind and body; and (2) difficulties which arise from the law of the conservation of energy. These perplexities are, perhaps, more imaginary than real; yet they have been very influential.

One result of the difficulties, or supposed difficulties, in the notion of interaction, is the adoption of parallelism. According to the parallelist doctrine, the two series of events, the mental and the physical, run on side by side without mutual influence. For every mental event there is a physical event, but neither one is the cause of the other. A difficulty arises for parallelism from the fact that empirically the series of mental states is not continuous. For example, we sometimes go to sleep. Unless we are to take the point of view of indeterminism, we must assume, either that physical events may cause mental events (which is contrary to the parallelist hypothesis), or that, intervening between the mental states of which we are conscious, there are *subconscious* mental states.

According to epiphenomenalism, the mental series accompanies the physical series as a sort of shadow. The mental events are produced by the physical states; but there is no return influence. The causal relation is only one-way. In other words, epiphenomenalism relaxes the ban upon

interaction sufficiently to permit action of body upon mind, but not of mind upon body. It need not, however postulate a continuous series of mental events; and in refraining from doing so, it keeps closer to the empirically verifiable facts. For in the nature of the case, the subconscious events which the parallelist assumes in the interest of continuity, are *inferred*, and not immediately known.

A view of the mind-body problem which seems to be more prevalent among psychologists than epiphenomenalism, is neutral monism or the double-aspect theory. According to the double-aspect theory, mind and body, instead of being distinct entities, are two sides or aspects or manifestations of the same fundamental reality. This fundamental reality is neither mental nor physical; yet, in some sense, it is both mental and physical. Perhaps a better statement of the monist position is this, that the ultimate constituents of reality are "neutral entities," which in certain combinations are mental, and in certain other combinations are physical. Inasmuch as the same entity may at one and the same time belong to more than one combination, it may be both mental and physical. Thus we reach the view known in the theory of knowledge as epistemological monism.

If I may speak in the first person, it does not seem to me that either epiphenomenalism, as ordinarily interpreted, or neutral monism is wholly satisfactory. The view which I would suggest is a modification of epiphenomenalism. It would retain the theory that the mental series is discontinuous, but would permit us to suppose a causal action of the mental upon the physical, as well as of the physical upon the mental. According to this view, which is here merely suggested, mind is indeed, *transitory*; it may be said to *arise out of matter*; and yet, while it lasts, it is efficient.

To describe the trend of contemporary psychology is rendered exceedingly difficult by the fact that there is no single obvious trend. Perhaps we should speak in the plural of *trends*, rather than of *a trend*. For there are many tend-

encies, some of which are conflicting. It seems to me, however, that the ones which I have described are the main currents. Certain tendencies which figure very largely in *magazine psychology*, appear to me to be eddies rather than main currents. Three of these are Spiritism, Telepathy, and The Subconscious. A few words may be in order concerning each of these, and then I shall be done.

Spiritism and telepathy are not taken very seriously by scientific psychologists for the reason that the evidence which is alleged in their favor is for the most part, of an episodal, fragmentary, and, in general, unverifiable character; and for the further reason that such evidence as may be verified, does not require these hypotheses, but may be otherwise explained. If phenomena are rightly to claim the attention of the scientist, they must be capable of repetition under standardized conditions. Alleged events that require darkness and are mixed up with trickery and, in general, are staged in such a way as to make it difficult to maintain an attitude of scientific impartiality, are better ignored. Then, too, it must be remembered that one of the fundamental principles of scientific method is the "law of parsimony." *Entia non multiplicanda sunt*, said William of Occam, "*præter necessitatem*." Entities, that is principles, hypotheses, are not to be multiplied beyond necessity. Unless, then, the evidence for spiritism and telepathy is of such a nature as to be absolutely inexplicable by principles which are already accepted, these hypotheses cannot be regarded as established.

Concerning the subconscious a little more must be said. Here the case is not so much one of the weighing of evidence as of the interpretation of language. "The popular conception of the subconscious is that of a separate 'secondary' or subconscious 'self' or 'mind,' having all the reality of the 'primary' or conscious mind, but living an independent life alongside of it. According to this view, man has two minds, one conscious and the other subconscious, sharply separated from each other but interacting."

"This theory was promulgated by T. J. Hudson some twenty-five or thirty years ago in his book, *The Law of Psychic Phenomena*—no doubt one of the most popular books on psychology ever written, and yet one having no scientific standing whatever."¹¹ According to Hudson, the subjective or subconscious mind takes cognizance of the environment by "intuition." It is also the "seat of the emotions and the storehouse of memory," and "is constantly amenable to the power of suggestion." Somewhat different is the view of Sigmund Freud. Instead of two "minds," one conscious and the other subconscious, Freud speaks of the conscious and subconscious *layers or levels* of the one mind. The subconscious he then subdivides into the foreconscious and the unconscious. Thus the mind consists, as it were, of three strata, the conscious, the foreconscious, and the unconscious. The contents of the foreconscious readily pass the threshold of consciousness. The elements of the unconscious, on the contrary, come up into the foreconscious and the conscious with considerable difficulty, as resistance is encountered at the threshold of the foreconscious. "The unconscious, according to Freud, is the 'real self,' whose inner nature is unknown to us, and is only imperfectly revealed to us in consciousness. It is made up, he teaches, of memories, thoughts, desires, etc., which have been 'repressed' because they are for some reason painful to consciousness, or contrary to the higher moral nature."¹²

Morton Prince has a different division. In his scheme the subconscious falls into two compartments, the Coconscious and the Unconscious. The Coconscious is made up of active, intelligent processes, coexisting with, but dissociated from, the personality; the Unconscious, on the other hand, is composed of traces of previous conscious processes in the neurones of the brain. The Coconscious,

¹¹ Moore, J. S., *Foundations of Psychology*, p. 203.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 221.

therefore, is a *psychological* concept, the Unconscious a *physiological* one, in Prince's system.¹⁸

It is rather risky to express an opinion in this matter, but my feeling is that contemporary scientific psychologists, as distinguished from *magazine* psychologists, tend to prefer Prince's theory of the Unconscious to that of Freud. By defining his Unconscious in *physiological* terms Prince avoids the self-contradictory notion of an *unconscious consciousness*. For we may object to the theory of the Unconscious as held by Freud that to be conscious is of the essence of mind; and therefore, by definition, what is unconscious, cannot be mental. This, however, is hardly fair, as the believer in unconscious mental elements need not interpret the term unconscious with rigid literalness. He may, perhaps, mean, not the utter absence of consciousness, but merely its presence in a low degree of intensity. From this point of view, just as darkness is not necessarily the absence of light, but only a small intensity of it; and as cold is a low degree of heat; so unconsciousness is a low degree of consciousness. Thus interpreted, the idea of the Unconscious is not logically absurd. It is not enough, however, to show that a concept is not logically absurd. There ought to be some positive evidence in its favor. And, in the case of the Unconscious, as commonly interpreted, this appears to be lacking. In the nature of the case, if the distinction between facts of experience and inferences from facts can be maintained at all, the Unconscious, in this sense, belongs to the latter category rather than to the former. It is an inference from the postulate of continuity. Thus, to bridge over the discontinuity between yourself and myself, we may, if we will, suppose the existence of a subconscious or unconscious mind with which both of us are continuous. Another mode of approach starts from the discontinuities in the conscious experience of the individual. Does the substantial soul continue to exist when the man is in a state of

¹⁸ Prince, *The Unconscious*, See Preface and Chap. VIII.

dreamless sleep? Or, if you are an actualist instead of a substantialist in your theory of the self, is the series of mental events continuous? If it is, the problem of sleep presents essentially the same difficulty for the actualist as it does for the substantialist. In either case, periods of empirical unconsciousness must be bridged over, if continuity is to be maintained, by interpolating unconscious mentality of some sort. There must be an Unconscious Mind, or at any rate, there must be unconscious mental events.

Observe however, that this inference is necessary *only on the assumption of continuity*. Empirically, the mental life is not continuous. If we adhere to the empirical point of view, and eschew *a priori* reasoning, the concept of an unconscious mental life is unnecessary.

These objections do not apply, however, to Prince's doctrine of the Unconscious. The distinctive feature of Prince's conception is his theory of *neurograms*. Every mental experience, as all physiological psychologists admit, leaves traces or "dispositions" in the neurones of the brain. But as every such experience involves, not merely a single neurone, but a number of distinct but related neurones, this "brain record" is a complex and highly organized one in each case—a "brain pattern." These brain patterns Prince calls *Neurograms*, and these neurograms have the same relation to ideas that a phonogram (phonograph record) has to the sound which produces and is produced by it. The Unconscious as a whole, then, is the great storehouse of neurograms, which are the physiological records of our mental lives.¹⁴

We need not assume, in order to explain the possibility of reproducing the tones of Melba and Caruso, that they *exist between times* in the form of *unmusical music*; no more need we, in order to explain the possibility of *memory*, assume the existence of *unconscious ideas*. That which persists is not the idea itself, but rather the apparatus by means of which the idea can be produced.

¹⁴ Prince, *The Unconscious*, p. 109ff.

Thus the trend of psychology is away from unregulated speculation toward the method of standardized observation and controlled experiment. First the facts must be discovered, and then hypotheses must be found to account for the facts. Psychology is wonderfully popular these days. The very words "psychology" and "psychological" are terms to conjure with. But the science must slough off fantastic excrescences. In short, what for want of a better term I have called "magazine psychology," must give way to a psychology which is sober and scientific.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.

III

THE HIGH MISSION OF THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE¹

DAVID B. SCHNEDER

To be permitted to speak in celebration of the founding of a Christian college is a privilege any man might covet, for the founding of a Christian higher institution of learning is an event of great significance and blessing in the life of a nation. How great a service the Christian colleges of America have rendered to this nation, to humanity, and to the kingdom of God, it is impossible to measure. Among them Ursinus College has made a high and honorable record. Yet it is not wrong on an occasion like this, I believe, to endeavor to think over again the mission of these Christian schools. Profound changes have in recent years taken place. They are even now taking place. Under the new circumstances produced by these changes is it not timely to try to make clear to ourselves just what these institutions can and should in the future accomplish in the life of the nation, and also of the world, for the good that a Christian college does is no longer confined within national boundaries? To state the mission of the Christian college of today in a single sentence, it is, it seems to me, to conserve and advance the spiritual element in the world's civilization. Other objects of course are included in this. The raising up of Christian workers, the strengthening of the Church, and the progress of the kingdom of God are all included. But broadly stated, the mission of the Christian college is this, I believe.

The struggle between the spiritual and the material elements in civilization is always going on. The things of

¹ An address spoken on Founders' Day, at Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa., by the Rev. D. B. Schneder, D.D., President of North Japan College, Sendai, Japan.

sense are always contending with the values of the spirit. From the time that Esau sold his birthright for a mess of pottage until to-day when statesmen high up in the official life of the American nation sell their own and their country's honor, for sordid gain, the conflict between the spiritual and material elements in life and civilization has been going on and will go on. Therefore the effort to conserve and further the spiritual will always be needed, and the work of special spiritualizing forces, such as Christian institutions of learning are, will always be a boon. But I believe that we are living in a time that may extend many decades into the future, during which the trend toward the materialization of life and civilization is specially strong. Theoretical, or philosophical, materialism is dead, but practical materialism is very much alive. All over the world, the trend toward making material betterment the dominating aim of life and civilization is very marked. To say nothing of religious claims, even ethical considerations are being thought of more lightly. The public conscience more and more justifies people in freely seeking carnal pleasures as their natural right. The struggle for wealth and luxury is becoming more intense and less scrupulous, and the spiritual interests of life are being crowded out of people's thoughts and hearts to an increasing degree. These things are specially true in the midst of the present unprecedented prosperity of American life. The fine idealism that characterized America during the World War seems to have largely evaporated, and instead the only new thing is the abandon and wantonness with which people have fallen back into their old carnal and selfish ways. The enormous increase in the attractiveness and accessibility of provision for all forms of amusement and pleasure seem too much for a large proportion of the young people of the land, while those of maturer years are almost entirely engrossed in the struggles to get ahead in material welfare and aggrandizement. In a country differing from America so widely as does Japan the general tend-

ency, at least up to the time of the great earthquake, was the same. It was a weakening of the old religious appeals and ethical standards, and a new craze for pleasure and wealth and luxury. In Soviet Russia the good that is to be so equally distributed is only material good, and religion and spirituality receive scant courtesy. And all the world over there is a similar tendency. It is the outstanding characteristic of the present time. It is true that there are things that relieve somewhat the anxiety awakened by this picture. Serious people everywhere are awake to the situation as never before. Facts gathered together in a recent book entitled "The Revolt of Youth," or, again, the spirit manifested at the Indianapolis Student Volunteer Convention, are heartening. Nevertheless on the whole the trend today toward a deterioration of life and civilization to a splendid but hollow and unsatisfying materialism is very special and very strong.

Now when one casts about for a force that will check this disquieting tendency of present-day civilization and conserve its spiritual and uplifting elements, the first agency that would occur to many minds is that of education. Benjamin Kidd in his book, "The Science of Power," has shown how mighty education is and how it can make over in fifty years the psychology of a whole nation. However, in relation to the point about which we are concerned now, education can be divided into two kinds: that which on account of being sustained by taxes paid by people of various faiths, or no faith, is not able to teach religion; and, secondly, the education that is free from this limitation. I believe that it must be frankly acknowledged that education of the first kind can not do much positive work toward staying the trend toward a materialistic civilization. Education, especially in a democracy, necessarily reflects, and in its turn fosters, the prevailing spirit of the time, except that it can not reflect and foster the religious element of that spirit. It transmits the thinking and the practice of the adult population to the

youth of the country, minus its religious thinking and practice. Consequently the public education of America is even less spiritual, and more predominantly materialistic, than the general American spirit itself is. Is not this true? Is not the god of worldly success the highest deity in the pantheon of most state education?

But on the other hand education of the kind that is free as to religious teaching, and especially the kind whose special mission and responsibility it is to emphasize the spiritual, offers a great hope. The education imparted by the Christian colleges in the past already shows their great power in this respect. There is nothing finer in American history than the influence of these historic institutions of learning in upholding and fostering the lofty idealism and spirituality of our past national life. And in these days of anxiety about the tendencies of the present, these days of perplexity as to what to do to deliver humanity from what seems to be an increasing thralldom to the carnal and the sensuous and the selfish, I do not believe that the American people will look to their Christian colleges in vain. Here they stand, and they can help.

In a certain sense the whole Christian church can help and does help, of course. The church stands as the great bulwark against the onflowing tide of materialism and worldliness. Through the church the Spirit of God works in the hearts of men and women, and makes them partakers of that eternal life that lifts them up above the slavery to the material interests and the sensuous pleasures of life. But the Christian college as an arm of the church is in a very special way fitted for this high task. The Christian college brings the light of study and thought to bear upon the great problems of God and the world; upon the insistent problems of human life and destiny, and of human society and civilization. And it does it all under the enlightenment and guidance of Him who is "the light of the world," and who said, "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness,

but shall have the light of life." The Christian college depicts what the world has been in the past; it gives a thorough-going but sane description of what it is now; and in the light of God's revelation through Christ and the deep convictions of the human heart, it gives the vision of the glory of what ought to be. It does not hide the fact that between what is and what ought to be there lies a long hard struggle, and it boldly delivers the challenge of the cross. But in order that the battle for a better world may be fought intelligently and effectively, it also gives a knowledge of the forces that may be counted on, and of the best methods to employ in the conflict. And finally, during its four precious years of contact with them, the Christian college not only awakens its students intellectually, but it also awakens the best that is in them spiritually. It brings out young men and young women in the highest sense. It fits them for leadership and fills them with the inspiration and enthusiasm needed for their important task. It was my privilege in Japan to stand upon the top of Mt. Fuji, the peerless, and to look out over the land of Yamato and over the broad expanse of the Pacific Ocean beyond, and somehow it seems to have made a difference with me ever since. The truly Christian college sends out young men and women who have been upon the mountain-top and have seen a vision, and who can discern, and have a purpose to realize their vision. And it is through this kind of exalted service that the Christian college stands today as the strongest and the most hopeful antidote against the materialistic tendencies of our time. Nothing, I believe, can take its place.

However, in order that the Christian colleges may ever fulfill their high mission, and fulfill it with redoubled strength and effectiveness in the midst of the extraordinary onrush of materialism and sin at the present time, it is well that these colleges consider whether their policy and methods are in the highest degree adapted to the great end set before them, or whether improvement in these respects is

possible. If I, with my limited knowledge of educational conditions in America, were allowed to make any suggestions I would say that the Christian colleges should go both backward and forward. I would say that they should go backward more fully to the old cultural idea. I believe that the old college idea inherited from England of educating the man or the woman as such, and without immediate reference to bread-winning, should receive new consideration by the Christian colleges. There should be time to acquire a general view of nature, of humanity, and of God. Science in its outline should be studied. Humanity's past should receive attention—not only its political, and economic history, but also the history of its literature and philosophy. And then there should be the study of the so-called "new humanities" that is, psychology, ethics, sociology, economics and politics. Finally, religion should be studied, not as something separate and super-added but as an integral part of a cultural education. This it seems to me is a most important point. In order that a man may be truly educated, he needs to be educated not only in reference to nature below him and to humanity around him, but also in relation to God above him. It is through this contact with the higher and abiding realities most of all that he becomes a truly educated man. And all this cultural study should be so unhurried, and so free from material motives, that the student has time to form the habit of thinking broadly and deeply and constructively concerning all things. Then in the true sense will he become a cultured man. But on the other hand the Christian colleges are called upon to go forward, I believe. The student must be educated not only as an individual, but also as a social, being. He must be educated through the past for the future. Stating it in its highest terms, the student should be educated, not only as a man, but also as a factor in the Kingdom of God. The old English idea of educating a gentleman is defective here, and must be supplemented by a phase of education that will make a man not only statically admirable, but

also actively serviceable. The ideal of the Kingdom of God has gained an appeal to the human heart the world over that it has never had before. In America, in Japan, China and India, in Germany, in England, in France—everywhere, there are earnest souls that see the vision of universal brotherhood under one common Fatherhood and long for its realization. The students of the world to a remarkable degree have the vision. It is the most amazing and the most hopeful thing in the world to-day. But it is for the Christian college to give to its students an understanding of this ideal. It must teach Christianity in its essence, and also in its ethical, social, economic, national and international bearings. Columbia University through its distinguished president advocates the international mind; it is for the Christian college to teach about the dynamic behind the international mind. The Christian college must teach its students concerning the church as the greatest factor in the realization of the Kingdom ideal—teach them its nature, and its strength and weakness. In short the young men and young women that go out from the Christian colleges must be sanely and constructively intelligent concerning the most significant world phenomenon of to-day, namely, the ideal of the Kingdom. They must be men and women who in the genuine spirit of service and sacrifice have as their dominant life purpose to "seek first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness," believing that all other things needful will be added unto them. These will be men and women of the highest type, men and women, preëminently, for the time; men and women whose influence will be true and abiding. If the Christian college can succeed in sending out a large proportion of such men and women, then will they not only be true to the church which sustains them, but they will be saviors of a true civilization, and will make themselves felt as a permanent necessity in the life of the American nation.

In advocating such a program for the Christian colleges I am not unmindful, of course, of the great difficulties that

stand in the way of the reconstruction that would be needed in many cases to carry out the program. The opposition of the practical spirit of our time, which requires so insistently that every college graduate, unless he intends to take a higher course of study, be good for something; in other words, that he be equipped with a good bread-winning capacity, would have to be reckoned with, and as competition in the kinds of activity generally considered eligible for college graduates grows keener, the pressure to strengthen the vocational courses at the expense of the general culture courses becomes stronger and often apparently irresistible. Or, if the student is looking forward to entrance into a professional school after graduation, then there comes pressure from the higher institution for emphasis upon studies that specially prepare for his higher work. Correspondingly the tendency to crowd out the subjects that have no direct relation to the pursuit of that higher work gains in strength. In the Japanese educational system the colleges were originally intended to be purely cultural, but on account of pressure from higher up they are to-day purely preparatory schools for the universities. It is one of the most regrettable occurrences in the history of Japanese education, but the tendency toward the same unfortunate result is in evidence in America as well. Consequently if the Christian college should, in accordance with the ideal that has been outlined, adopt a curriculum that comprised a large proportion of required subjects that had no vocational value, or were not helpful for entrance upon some higher course of study, there is the possibility, if not the probability, that the number of young people who wish to take a Christian college course might decidedly decrease. Another difficulty is that of securing a teaching staff that would be competent to carry out such a program of spiritual education. The staff of a Christian college should consist entirely of Christian men and women, and not only the subjects of a spiritual character, but practi-

cally all subjects, should be taught from a standpoint sympathetic with Christianity. But how to assemble a teaching staff fully competent for such a purpose would not be an easy problem. As to ways of meeting these difficulties I feel almost totally incompetent to offer any suggestions. However, having been obliged to meet similar difficulties in Japan, I may perhaps be permitted to say a few things. In the first place, there is a great deal in having an ideal and working toward it. If the ideal of a truly Christian college is held steadily before the minds of those who are responsible for its guidance, more may be accomplished than at first seems possible. Changes may be made gradually rather than suddenly. Moreover, there are two ways of strengthening the Christian cultural element of a curriculum. One is by increasing the number of hours; the other is by placing superior, inspiring teachers in charge of that element. As to the danger of loss of students, large numbers are not always pure gain. But with care also, numbers may not decrease materially. Gradually parents and their sons and daughters may find out that with a broad Christian cultural education the college graduate may indeed not rise so quickly at first, but will live a far more influential, satisfactory and truly successful life in the long run. The best blacksmith is he whose whole body is developed, not only his right arm. Moreover, on account of economic prosperity the possibility of taking post-graduate work for vocational preparation is open to many more college graduates now than formerly. As to provision for competent teaching staffs for the Christian colleges, is there not a call to the prominent theological seminaries of the country, and to the great universities that are established upon Christian foundations, to provide special courses to meet this important need? The Christian colleges of America can not fulfill their mission unless their teaching staffs consist largely of men and women who are

both of superior personality and are specifically prepared for their calling.

Unless the Christian colleges and the churches sustaining them feel that these institutions have a great special mission to fulfill, a mission higher and more significant than that of the great state institutions, toward society, toward the country, toward humanity and civilization, and go forward with faith and courage, they will fail. But if on the other hand they take themselves seriously and assume the positive, forward-looking and determined attitude, they can and will succeed. And if they succeed, and fulfill the unspeakably high mission to which they are called, only eternity can reveal the good they will do. Let them work out their ideal under these new circumstances of our time, let them fix their goal, and then let them set their faces like a flint toward the realization of their ideal, the reaching of their goal, keeping the straight road. The motto of the oldest college on the American continent is, "Pro Christo et ecclesia." That motto is not antiquated; rather has it acquired a new meaning and a new and strange force. Pro Christo! Pro ecclesia! If the Christian college remains true to that motto it will never perish.

Representing not only myself, but also a sister institution beyond the seas, North Japan College at Sendai, Japan, I offer to Ursinus College my sincerest congratulations on its founding, and on the fifty-five years of its noble and useful history. Many young lives have been introduced into a larger, more exalted life here. Many men and women have gone out from here to make the world better. Some of them have gone among that largest aggregation of human beings upon the face of the earth yonder in the Far East, to let their light shine, and one of them now wears the martyr's crown. But the thing on which I congratulate Ursinus College most sincerely this day is its steady and unswerving loyalty to the spiritual purpose of its founding. Ursinus College has made a good record pro Christo, pro ecclesia,

and I doubt not that in the days to come it will continue to be an increasing factor in the best life of America and of the world. May God's rich blessing abide upon this Christian institution of learning, and upon the generations of precious lives that come here and tarry a while and then go out to strive for "a new heaven, and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

LANCASTER, PA.

IV

THE CONTRIBUTION OF DR. JAMES I. GOOD TO REFORMED CHURCH HISTORY

WILLIAM J. HINKE

When on January 22, 1924, the Rev. Dr. James I. Good passed away in Philadelphia, the Reformed Church lost one of its most devoted sons and one of its best known historians. It is, therefore, fitting that the ending of such a useful life be duly noted and its contribution to the life of the Church be rightly estimated.

Dr. Good was descended from a family whose members had been for generations Reformed people. His great-grand-father, Jacob Guth, came from Zweibrücken, Germany, arriving at Philadelphia September 9, 1765. He settled at first in Lancaster county, moved later to Schaefters-town, Lebanon county, and finally to Bern Church, near Reading. There he became the parochial schoolmaster, who not only taught the children but also preached frequently on Sundays, in the absence of the pastor. His services were so much appreciated by the people that they urged him to enter the ministry. Hence he petitioned Synod to examine and ordain him. In response to this request Synod appointed a committee to examine him in the fall of that year (*Minutes, 1801, 2d session, § 4*). But, before he could be ordained, he died February 12, 1802.

Of the second generation two sons, Joseph and Philip (the latter Dr. Good's grandfather) became members of the Pennsylvania legislature.

Of the third generation three became prominent. Jeremiah H. Good was professor in the Reformed Theological Seminary at Tiffin, Ohio, Reuben Good became professor of natural sciences in Heidelberg College, Tiffin, and William A. Good (Dr. Good's father) was early in life (1836-41)

the first rector of the preparatory department of Marshall College and later the first County Superintendent of Public Schools in Berks county. With such an ancestry of teachers behind him the life and achievements of Dr. Good become more intelligible.

James Isaac Good was born December 31, 1850, at York, Pennsylvania, while his father was pastor there. He received his education in Lafayette College, from which institution he was graduated in 1872, with the degree of A.B. In 1875, his Alma Mater conferred on him the degree of A.M. Even as a student he distinguished himself, for he wrote "An Essay on the Works and Language of Pope," which was published at Easton in 1872, a pamphlet of 33 pages. This was his first literary production. He studied theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York, and, when he graduated from that institution in 1875, was called as pastor of Heidelberg Reformed Church, York, where he was ordained and installed June 16, 1875. For two years he filled that position. He was then called to Heidelberg Reformed Church, Philadelphia, which he served from 1877-90. He found it one of the weakest churches in the city. He left it one of the strongest and most flourishing. His third and last pastorate was in Calvary Reformed Church, Reading, where he ministered from 1890-1905. At the death of Dr. J. H. A. Bomberger in 1890, Dr. Good was elected professor of church history in Ursinus School of Theology. Three years later he was transferred to the chair of dogmatics and pastoral theology and made dean of the Seminary. It was mainly through his instrumentality that the Seminary was moved to Philadelphia in 1898. He was professor in Ursinus until the Seminary united in 1907 with the Theological Seminary at Tiffin, Ohio. The united seminary was located at Dayton, Ohio, as Central Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church. In this institution Dr. Good filled the chair of Reformed Church history and liturgics to the time of his death.

Dr. Good held many positions of honor and trust. He was president of the General Synod of the Reformed Church, 1911-14; president of the American Section of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches, Vice-President of the World Alliance of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches, Vice-President of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Honorary Member of the Huguenot Society of Pennsylvania, and President of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Church for thirty-one years (1893-1924). He was a member of numerous historical societies and for years made his influence felt far beyond the limits of his own church. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Ursinus College in 1887 and the degree of LL.D. by the same institution in 1911.

Of the many-sided activity of Dr. Good one stands out prominently as the most important as well as the most enduring. It is his literary activity, which was almost entirely devoted to the history of the Reformed Church. To his own contemporaries Dr. Good is known in many ways, as a pastor, teacher and president of the Board of Foreign Missions. But to later generations he will be known best by the numerous historical works which he has left to his church. They are his best and noblest monument.

But Dr. Good was more than a mere writer of popular books on church history. He showed throughout the spirit of the true historian, who appreciates the importance of gathering and using the original sources of history. Hence he began at an early period to equip himself with a large historical apparatus.

He was an indefatigable and enthusiastic collector of Reformed books, especially books on Reformed Church history. He was in constant touch with the leading bookdealers in Europe. He made also numerous trips to Europe for the sake of historical research. It is said that he crossed the Atlantic fifty-two times in twenty-six summers. During these trips he visited many of the book centers of Europe and

acquired there a large number of important and rare books dealing with Reformed history. His interest, which began with German and Swiss Reformed history, gradually extended until it included France, Poland, Hungary, Russia and Scotland. As a result of his long and discriminate collecting of Reformed books he amassed what is undoubtedly the largest and most important library of Reformed books in this country, which, by the terms of his will, is to be deposited in the library of the seminary with which he was last connected and will thus become a worthy memorial to his historical zeal and activity.

After collecting printed books for a number of years, Dr. Good turned his attention to the manuscript sources of Reformed history. In 1895, he visited Amsterdam, Holland, and found there in the archives of the Classis of Amsterdam a large portfolio of letters, relating to Pennsylvania. These he ordered copied, but when they came into his possession he was disappointed in finding only one or two minutes of the *Cœtus* of Pennsylvania. In the summer of 1896, at the suggestion of Mr. Dotterer, he visited the archives of the General Synod of the Dutch Church at The Hague. There he discovered several bound volumes of Pennsylvania documents and also a large bundle of letters, which upon examination proved to contain an almost complete set of *Cœtus* minutes, from 1747 to 1792. It was a marvelously rich find, indeed so extensive that he alone was unable to transcribe all the documents. Hence, on his return to America, he requested the writer to assist him in securing transcripts of all the documents in the Dutch archives, bearing on the Reformed Church of Pennsylvania. In response to this request the writer became first attracted to and interested in Reformed Church history. His commission was carried out in the summers of 1897 and 1898, with the result that about 4000 pages of transcripts were secured and 1000 photographs were taken of the more important documents. To have made these important manuscript sources

accessible to the Reformed Church will always remain the greatest single service which Dr. Good rendered his church.

Nor should it be forgotten that, in order to be able to render this service, Dr. Good was willing to bring great personal sacrifices. He spent not only thousands of dollars in the acquisition of Reformed books, but in the securing, transcribing and translating of these documents he invested about \$4000. All this he did without any selfish motive and with but one purpose and end in view, namely to make the history of the Reformed Church better known to its members.

The same kind of search was made by the writer, at the expense of Dr. Good, in England, Germany and Switzerland, with the result that many valuable documents were secured and much new light was shed on the careers of about twenty-five of the early Reformed ministers, who came to America from Europe.

Having secured the large historical treasures, reposing in the archives of Europe, Dr. Good turned his attention next to the collecting and transcribing of similar historical documents in the United States. One of the first places visited were the archives of the Dutch Reformed Church at New Brunswick, New Jersey. Into these archives a bundle of Pennsylvania letters had strayed through the activity of the Hon. J. R. Brodhead, who had collected historical documents for the Dutch Church in Holland. Among the documents he thus brought to America was also a bundle of about seventy letters from Pennsylvania. These, which had been deposited in the archives at New Brunswick, were carefully examined and copied by Dr. Good.

But the most important collection of Reformed documents in this country had been made by the Rev. Dr. Henry Harbaugh, the father of Reformed Church history in Pennsylvania. After the death of Dr. Harbaugh these documents passed into private hands. These were also carefully transcribed. When at a later time there was a rumor that they

were on the point of being bought by the State of Pennsylvania, the writer appealed to Dr. Good to save them from that fate. He at once heeded the appeal and ordered their purchase. Thus through his promptness and liberality he saved these precious documents to the Reformed Church. In 1911, while president of the General Synod, he offered to restore the Harbaugh Manuscripts to the Church, whose property they had been originally. By this generous act he crowned his long labors in behalf of the preservation of Reformed records.

But the collection of Reformed books and manuscripts was not an end in itself for Dr. Good. He rather used them as a means to write a long list of important historical books, which aimed to make Reformed history better known to its members. Indeed, as a writer of church history he was just as indefatigable as a collector of books. Hence it came to pass that he developed into the most prolific writer in the Reformed Church, having to his credit more than twenty titles.

The first book published by Dr. Good was *The Origin of the Reformed Church in Germany*, which appeared at Reading in 1887. In it he gave an interesting account of the rise and spread of the Reformed faith in Germany. He shows that preparations for the Reformed faith were made by the work of Bucer at Strassburg, Lambert in Hesse, John A'Lasco at Bremen and Melanchthon in the Palatinate. Its introduction was marked by the adoption of the Heidelberg Catechism by the Elector Frederick III, of the Palatinate, in 1563. After that date the Reformed Church spread along the Rhine into Western Germany, and was then introduced into Anhalt, Lippe, Hesse and Brandenburg. The story of the Reformed Church is brought down to the Synod of Dort in 1619. The whole record is told in a simple form, without display of much learning or elaborate citation of authorities, although the writer had studied and used his sources carefully throughout his book.

One feature which distinguished this book is also found in all his later works, the use of illustrations, of which fourteen are found in this volume. The author had a rare sense for art and beauty. His home in Reading was filled with many beautiful pictures and his garden with beautiful flowers. He cultivated this taste for pictures in the collection of a large number of illustrations, prints, etchings and photographs, which he had carefully mounted in several large albums. From this collection he drew for the numerous illustrations, which made his books attractive to the ordinary reader.

His next book appeared in 1889, entitled *Rambles round Reformed Lands*. In it he proved that his numerous trips to Europe were made not for pleasure merely, but for serious study. He introduces the reader to the many places in Switzerland and Germany, which have become famous in Reformed history. All these places are described to bring out the influence of the Reformed Church in them, to describe important historical landmarks as well as the forces active in church life, which still characterize the various places.

In 1910, Dr. Good reverted once more to this subject, when he published *Famous Places of the Reformed Churches*. This was not merely a revised edition of his former work, but it was entirely re-written and brought up to date. He had also added to the places described in the former volume chapters on Reformed places in France, Holland, Bohemia, England, Wales, and Ireland, with a special chapter on "Edinburgh," contributed by the Rev. Dr. Marcus A. Brownson. This new book was well described by the author as "a religious guide-book to Europe."

The two books published in 1887 and 1889 directed the attention of the church to the young and energetic pastor of Heidelberg Reformed Church, Philadelphia, who by his able studies gave promise of future usefulness. When, therefore, Dr. Bomberger died in 1890, Dr. Good was

elected to become professor of church history in Ursinus School of Theology. Three years latter he was transferred to the chair of dogmatics and pastoral theology and was made dean of the Seminary. The extraordinary capacity for work which Dr. Good manifested in all his life, appeared never more clearly than from 1890-1905. During this time he was not only teaching numerous branches of theological studies in the Seminary, was ministering to a large and growing church in Reading, was making almost annual trips to Europe, but he also found time to write an ever increasing number of important historical books, which established his fame as a Reformed historian.

In 1894, Dr. Good issued a *History of the Reformed Church of Germany, 1620-1890*, which presented in a single volume the record of the varying fortunes of the Reformed Church in the Fatherland. It showed the awful persecutions which the Reformed Church had to endure as well as its gradual spread and increase in influence. It was a notable contribution, which gave a comprehensive survey of the Reformed Church in Germany. Some of his critics found fault with him for writing this history from a partisan standpoint. Yet it should be remembered that in this book Dr. Good defended a thesis which is now generally accepted as correct, namely, that the Reformed Church of Germany was neither Melanchthonian in doctrine nor ritualistic in worship, as was at that time generally believed in this country. The church must be grateful to the author for having contributed to a correct understanding of Reformed history.

Even before this history appeared Dr. Good had launched upon another project, the publication of a historical magazine, whose first number appeared in February 1893, under the title *Reformed Church Magazine*. The double purpose of the magazine was to stir up interest in Reformed history and advocate aggressive church work. It claimed to look forward, backward and to the present. Hence its motto

was: "Conservative in theology, aggressive in church work." It advocated especially the cause of missions, at home and abroad. It also aimed to give help and inspiration to local church work by a Sunday School department, in which the lessons were explained and illustrated with touching incidents, taken from daily life. The editor himself contributed to the magazine interesting articles on Reformed history, especially on missions and missionaries of the Reformed Church, Reformed men in America and Women of the Reformed Church. Some of these articles were so well received and favorably commented upon, that the editor was induced to issue them revised and expanded, in separate books. Thus in 1901, appeared *Famous Women of the Reformed Church*, which contained twenty-five biographical sketches of famous Reformed women, in many lands and various centuries. In 1903, appeared *Famous Missionaries of the Reformed Church*, which presented in twenty-nine chapters a survey over Reformed missions. Two of the interesting points brought out in this book deserve notice. The author showed that the first Protestant missionaries in America were Peter Richer and William Cartier, whom Admiral Coligny sent to Brazil in 1555. Furthermore, the first missionary to the Indians in North America was not John Eliot, as we used to read in our school histories, but John Megapolensis, a Dutch Reformed missionary, who preached at Fort Orange, now Albany, New York, in 1644, two years before Eliot began his preaching at Newton, near Boston. But what impresses the reader of this book especially is the world-wide sweep of Reformed missions, vividly described by the author.

Another feature of the *Reformed Church Magazine* was the translation which it offered of the excellent commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism by the Rev. Otto Thelemann, entitled *An Aid to the Heidelberg Catechism*. The translation had been made by the Rev. Moses Peters, professor in Ursinus School of Theology. When completed this trans-

lation was issued in 1896 as a separate volume, at the expense of Dr. Good. The *Reformed Church Magazine* was continued for three years, 1893-96. In its third year the name was changed to *Reformed Historical Magazine*.

Dr. Good entered his special field of historical research, in which he made his most noteworthy contribution, in 1897. In that year the church celebrated the Sesqui-Centennial of its organization in this country. To mark this event Dr. Good wrote two pamphlets. The first was entitled *Early Fathers of the Reformed Church*. In it he presented short biographical sketches of seven Reformed pioneers. The second volume, entitled *Historical Handbook of the Reformed Church* was written for Christian Endeavor Societies, Brotherhoods of Andrew and Philip and Sunday Schools, to give them a more intelligent idea of the grand history of their church. The contents, which is thrown into short chapters and sections, with review questions at the end of the book, was well calculated to stimulate a revival of Reformed consciousness among the younger members of the church. As the book proved useful and popular, a second edition was issued in 1901.

What may be regarded as the most important work published by Dr. Good appeared in 1899. It was the *History of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1725-1792*. It was written after the archives of Holland, Germany and Switzerland had been ransacked and their contents, bearing on the history of the Reformed Church in this country, had been carefully gathered together. Equipped with these new sources the author was enabled to virtually rewrite the whole of our early history, basing himself not on uncertain family traditions, but on contemporaneous documents. The book revealed the direction of the Church of Holland in its missionary operations in Pennsylvania more clearly than ever before. The exact number of missionaries sent from Holland was ascertained, namely thirty-seven, as well as the exact number received by the Cetus of Pennsylvania, namely

twenty-seven, so that the whole number of members of the Cœtus was ascertained to be sixty-four. Besides, the author was also able to throw a good deal of light on the independent Reformed ministers, of whom he presented thirty-seven sketches. Thus he increased not only the total number of known Reformed ministers, who labored in the American colonies during the Cœtus period, but he added also many important details to their biographies. The result of this investigation was that the broad outlines of Reformed history in Pennsylvania were clearly sketched. Later historians may correct details, or add new facts in the lives of individual ministers, but they will always be able to build upon the foundations laid so well by Dr. Good in this book.

Dr. Good continued his investigation into the history of the Reformed Church in this country, bringing them down to the present day. In 1911, he published the *History of the Reformed Church in the U. S. in the Nineteenth Century*. This was an even more elaborate work than its predecessor, covering no less than 662 pages. In the preparation of this work the author had again made an amazing collection of original documents. He had laboriously collected and transcribed the manuscript minutes of the ten original Classes of the church, had ransacked the early files of church papers, had assembled the extensive pamphlet literature of the church, and had extracted many of the early magazines. As he felt that he was treading upon disputed ground he quoted his authorities more at length than in any of his earlier books. He goes at length into the details of the various controversies that disturbed the church for more than thirty years and brings to light many forgotten facts and data. It is again true that he writes to establish a thesis, the original character of the Reformed Church and the meaning of the liturgical movement through which the church passed, but he quotes his authorities from both sides so amply that he enables his reader to form in most cases his own conclusion. Whatever we may think of the work,

there can be no question that Dr. Good has tried to be fair and impartial, presenting the history of the church as it appeared to a low churchman. He has made a weighty contribution, which no future historian can afford to overlook.

In the year 1913, Dr. Good rounded out the series of Reformed histories by publishing a *History of the Swiss Reformed Church since the Reformation*. Here he presents in the compass of a single volume the complicated history of the Reformed Church in the various Reformed cantons of Switzerland. He adopts the biographical method of presentation, which enables him to make the main events revolve around important leaders. It is the only book in English, which attempts such a broad survey, through five successive periods, down to the present time. The task is well done and it was well worth the effort to gather together the many scattered facts into a unified record.

Some of the later books which Dr. Good wrote were meant to mark historic anniversaries. To commemorate the seventieth anniversary of the organization of the Board of Foreign Missions, Dr. Good published in 1908 a *Life of Rev. Benjamin Schneider, D.D.*, who was the first foreign missionary supported by the Reformed Church in Asia Minor. Although commissioned and sent out by the American Board in 1834, the Reformed Church undertook the support of Dr. Schneider in 1842 and continued it till 1866. From the files of the Reformed Church Messenger, the Missionary Herald and many private letters of Dr. Schneider, which had been placed at the disposal of the author, he constructed a biography which constitutes a beautiful monument to this missionary pioneer and worthily commemorates his heroic life and devoted missionary service.

The Quarto-Centennial of the birth of John Calvin in 1909 was marked by a pamphlet, entitled *Life Pictures of John Calvin*. It was a joint product of Dr. Good and Dr. George W. Richards. It consisted of extracts from the

Life of Calvin by his colleague, Theodore Beza, and from his own writings. It was illustrated by numerous pictures of places, buildings and articles connected with the reformer.

To commemorate the 350th anniversary of the publication of the Heidelberg Catechism, Dr. Good wrote several books and pamphlets. In 1913, appeared *The Heidelberg Catechism in Picture and Story*, an interesting pamphlet with numerous illustrations, intended for Catechetical Classes, Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies. It presents in an attractive way the main facts in the lives of the authors of the catechism and sketches briefly the history of the catechism in its homeland as well as in other lands.

More important was a larger book, which appeared in 1914, under the title *The Heidelberg Catechism in its Newest Light*. It aims to point out the great progress that has been made recently in our knowledge of the causes that led to the introduction of the Heidelberg Catechism into the Palatinate. It indicates the numerous sources that have been used in its composition and presents the new information in the lives of the authors of the catechism and finally it indicates the peculiar significance of the appearance of the catechism in the year 1563. The author paid special attention to the numerous translations of the catechism, which have marked its world-wide use. No less than twenty-seven translations are recorded by the author. It was a subject in which the writer had first interested him, by tracing the history of William Turner, the first translator of the catechism into English, and by starting a considerable collection of catechisms, to which Dr. Good added many others in the course of his travels and researches. In this book the author has brought together the latest and best information on the origin and history of the Heidelberg Catechism. The book is appropriately bound in blue and white, the colors of the Palatinate and it is decorated with the shield of the Elector.

The interest of the author in the Heidelberg Catechism had been shown before in 1904, when he published an *Aid*

to the Heidelberg Catechism, which consisted in a reprint of the Heidelberg Catechism in its longer and shorter form, selections from Bible history, a brief history of the Reformed Church, with selections of hymns and prayers. A similar purpose was served by *Historic Hints and Helps on the Heidelberg Catechism*, which appeared in 1913.

For the Quarto-Centennial of the Reformation in 1917, Dr. Good prepared a booklet on *Famous Reformers of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches*. It was meant to help missionary study classes to realize the meaning and importance of the reformation, especially as it took shape in Reformed lands. He sketches the rise and progress of the reformatory movement in Switzerland, through the labors of Zwingli and his successors, especially John Calvin. He also traces briefly the birth and progress of the reformation in Holland, Germany, Poland, Hungary, Italy and in Scotland. It is appropriately bound in black and gold, the colors of Zwingli. It is a book well calculated to arouse the interest of the young in the history of the church.

In 1916, appeared also *The Reformed Reformation*, in which the author aimed to bring out the special contribution which the Reformed reformers had made to the history of the church. In this book the author presents a good deal of new information to English readers on two precursors of the reformation, Thomas Wytenbach, the teacher of Zwingli, and James Lefevre (called also Faber Stapulensis by his contemporaries) the teacher of Farel, the co-laborer of Calvin. The author shows that through the recent investigations of Prof. Doumergue, a famous French scholar, new light has been thrown upon the important contribution which James Lefevre made to the reformation. In 1509, he published a work on the Psalms, which Luther used when he began to lecture on the Psalms in 1512. In the latter year, 1512, Lefevre published a work on the Pauline Epistles, which has been called "the first Protestant book." He also translated the Bible into French, completing his

work in 1530, before Luther finished his German translation. The author also discusses at length the question: Who was the first reformer, Zwingli or Luther? He comes to the conclusion that Zwingli's reformation was not only independent of Luther but also preceded it slightly in point of time, having been begun, on Zwingli's own testimony, in 1516. Finally, the author estimates what Zwingli contributed to the spirit of the reformation.

One of the last services which Dr. Good rendered the Reformed Church in a literary way was to act as chairman of the committee that published *The Hymnal of the Reformed Church*, in 1920. It was a joint product of two committees, one representing the Reformed Church in the United States, the other the Reformed Church in America. Dr. Good was chairman of the former committee. This book, in which the church may well take pride, bears eloquent testimony to the fine artistic taste of the editors and to their love and appreciation of beautiful and stately church music. The book contained among other beautiful hymns a number of reformation hymns by Zwingli, Calvin and others, which Dr. Good had issued as a separate pamphlet in 1917, under the title *Reformation Hymns of the Reformed Church*.

It is impossible in the compass of a brief sketch to refer to the many historical articles which appeared from the pen of Dr. Good in numerous historical or other magazines and periodicals, such as the *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* and the *Princeton Review*. Nor can we do more than merely allude to the innumerable articles which he contributed to the religious weeklies of the church.

In conclusion, attention may be drawn to the fact that it was Dr. Good who interested the Reformed and Presbyterian churches in the publication of Zwingli's Latin works in an English translation. He was indefatigable in enlisting interest and support in this venture. The volumes are to appear under the auspices of the American Society of Church History, with the financial assistance of the various

Reformed and Presbyterian churches. The first volume was issued under these auspices in 1922, edited by the writer and published by the Heidelberg Press of Philadelphia.

Dr. Good is no more, but his spirit still lives in the many students whom he trained for the ministry and in the numerous books which he left as a precious legacy to the Reformed Church.

AUBURN, N. Y.

V

THE PASTOR AS SHEPHERD

EMORY L. COBLENTZ, ESQ.

There is no word used by human tongue which so nearly expresses the functional idea of a true pastor as the word "shepherd." Wherever it is found in the Bible it is expressive of that cultural, want-supplying, protecting life and activity represented by the sincere, busy, loving Pastor. The shepherd Psalms find a place in the hearts of the people as do no others, and have been and always will be the comfort and consolation of countless thousands. How we all delight to sing the so-called shepherd hymns.

"Jesus, my Shepherd, let me share
Thy guiding hand, Thy tender care,
And let me ever find in Thee
A refuge and a rest for me."

written by our own Dr. Harbaugh, is one of the tenderest and most beautiful of the hymns sung by any people.

"And there were shepherds abiding in the field,
Keeping watch over their flocks by night," etc.

is familiar to every child with Christian training, and while in this particular instance the word "shepherds" has relationship to the humble calling of those in Oriental times who were guarding their flocks at the time of the birth of the Savior, yet in the very word there is a close association with the Master himself and likewise with the faithful minister of His word. In Christ's wonderful charge to Peter, found in John 21: 15-16-17, He gave direction to feed the lambs, to feed the sheep, and to feed the little and weak sheep. This is the call to the faithful pastor-shepherd of to-day. The test of love of Jesus is the feeding to the multitude of the bread of life which He came into the world to give.

The shepherd of a congregation or people is charged with their religious guidance. In speaking, therefore, of the

pastor as shepherd, my desire is to try to bring out in a practical way those elements in the pastor which are essential in order that he may be a good shepherd of his flock. In this discussion I shall speak mainly from the standpoint of a layman who for quite a number of years has had the opportunity of association with ministers of the Gospel and who has further had the opportunity of comparing them, in their relationship to their fellowman, with other professing Christians who are engaged in other vocations.

The ordinary pastor of a congregation does not have an easy task. It is not easy in the first place because of the tremendous responsibilities which it carries. It is not easy in the second place because of the various kind and character of people with whom he naturally comes in contact in his work; they are the broad and the narrow minded, the liberal and the orthodox, the learned and the ignorant, the sincere and the insincere, and in fact all classes and conditions of men are at times thrown into intimate contact with the busy pastor. There is no vocation or calling to-day which requires such a high degree of intelligence, such consecration of talents, such a broad, charitable view of humanity, as does that of the earthly shepherd of a congregation. And while possessing all of these essential elements, yet it seems to me there are additional qualities necessary to a successful pastor that are sometimes overlooked when we are appraising his usefulness and value.

The pastor must be a man among men. While he must always keep constantly before him the lofty character and dignity of the office which he bears, yet he must have that human, common, friendly touch necessary to attract, hold and help men. Frankly speaking I believe some of our ministers make a mistake in wearing at all times what is commonly called the "ministerial garb." It seems to me when a minister is not engaged in some official capacity, or is not making pastoral visits as such, the more nearly he can appear and be as other people, the better he will succeed. I

have in my mind now a minister, faithful and true, who never came on the street unless he was attired in a clerical garb such as is worn by most men in the pulpit. The result was that people, old and young, would respectfully bid him the time of day and pass quickly on; and if he perchance stopped to speak to someone, there was at once evidence of a difference in the very appearance of each which prevented that common, close, human touch which is so essential. I am, of course, aware that the color and shape of the cloth does not always indicate the character of the person it covers, and that a man may be a noble character and a gentleman whether he is well or poorly dressed. Nor am I advocating the careless, slipshod, undignified, and sometimes unclean, dress which I have known some ministers to adopt in public. Yet I do feel that at times the preacher should make those with whom he comes in contact from day to day feel that he is one of them, and that if their hearts can beat in love and sympathy with his in the cause for Christ and humanity, there is no difference between them.

There are some who believe that the challenge to laymen to become active in the affairs of the Kingdom, and the advantage which the acceptance of this challenge by many consecrated men and women has gained for the Church, has for its basis not only that laymen have a responsibility in the work of the Lord that is separate and distinct from that of the ordained minister, but that the layman, because of his close, common touch with his fellowman, in society and business, possessed a point of contact which the minister did not have. While there is undoubtedly a foundation for this belief, yet what it emphasizes can be minimized by the tactful, practical minister.

Not only should the pastor be a man in dress, but a man in bearing. Just as a child looks to the father for example and guidance, so does a people look to its minister. Stories of questionable propriety, conversation of the ordinary country store-box variety, habits of life, while not neces-

sarily wrong, yet in their cultural influence are not elevating, are not in keeping with the bearing of a true shepherd. I am not one of those who believe that the days of influence and power of the pastor are passing. There is no doubt that the office of the Christian minister has been put to severe tests during the past few years, but I believe that these tests are being more successfully met than most of us think, and that we are right now entering upon a period when things spiritual are going to be properly appraised, and their value in the things of life better understood than ever before.

But above all things the pastor must be a preacher. While it has been truthfully said that the good a minister does in a congregation is largely the result of his activities outside of the pulpit, yet I still believe that the greatest power that a minister can wield over the lives of a people is that which emanates from the pulpit. It is true his work here must be supplemented, and perhaps preceded, by other pastoral work, yet the pastor who pays little attention to the preparation of his sermons, who feels that it requires but little study to give his people, Sunday after Sunday, fruit from the Tree of Life which will nourish the souls of his hearers, is sadly mistaken. While there has been a great deal of discussion as to the failure of people during the present age to think, yet the man in the pulpit who believes that he can preach ill-prepared sermons on subjects that require little study, and be a successful shepherd of the flock, will not attain that degree of success which his office demands.

I do not believe there ever was a time when good, sound, practical preaching is so necessary and so effective as at the present time. The questions of theology, faith and doctrine have been settled to the satisfaction of most people, but the great principles which Christ preached and taught on the hills and upon the shore of Gallilee are just as much if not more applicable in these days as in the past. People are now disposed to look upon Christianity as a life rather than

a profession, and the successful preacher, in order to meet the requirements of the age, must endeavor to get into the hearts of his people, not alone an understanding of the unsearchable riches of grace as preached and taught by Jesus, but how they are to be expressed in their everyday lives. I heard this comment made recently upon a sermon delivered by one of our ministers, that he succeeded in awakening in the hearer a sense of uncertainty, of uncompleteness and of dissatisfaction with prevailing conditions in the world, yet never offered a single suggestion as to how to overcome and rise above these discouraging conditions. As a result, the hearers of this preacher, instead of being encouraged and satisfied, were disturbed and altogether uncertain as to what was needed to make the situation better. The present times present unusual opportunities for the practical, wide-awake, consecrated preacher to interpret the word of God to his flock in order to help them to resist the luxury loving, vain, lazy, and lack of consciousness to duty tendencies upon the part of people everywhere, which should not be overlooked by him in the preparation of his messages to his people.

There is an element of selfishness in the preaching of some of our ministers to-day, which leads him in the way of preaching a sermon that is satisfying alone to himself. I have no doubt that the minister in most cases is unconscious of what I am here charging him with, and would in all probability deny it if he had the opportunity. Let me illustrate: Not long ago a friend of mine was presiding at a service in one of our congregations; the order of service was quite full and it was desired that it should not extend beyond a certain time. In engaging the first speaker, it was explained clearly that his address should not be over a certain length, and that if it were longer it would necessarily cut out another part of the service which had been arranged for. At the time of the service the speaker was again informed of this provision, and his answer was he didn't believe he could confine himself to the allotted time; when

he was introduced he began his address by saying that he had been asked to speak only a certain length of time but he did not believe he could say what he desired to say in less than from ten to fifteen minutes longer than the time allotted, and as a matter of fact did speak that much longer. Now this good preacher doubtless was entirely unconscious of the element of selfishness in his attitude, and might possibly think unkindly of me for making use of this illustration, but what really was uppermost in his mind was the presentation of his address in a way to satisfy himself without regard to its effect upon the congregation as a whole or its place in the program itself. Cannot all who do public speaking recall occasions where it was felt by the speaker that the message should be given practically as prepared without regard to the conditions prevailing at the time, which may have required, in the interest of the general good of the cause, a radical modification of the sermon or address or sometimes its elimination altogether? While of course every preacher should endeavor to get joy and genuine pleasure out of the delivery of his sermons, yet he should remember that the real aim is to reach men and women, and to bring them into a saving relationship with the Savior of the world, and in this alone should be his chief joy. The good preacher will cut short his sermons during hot days, or on any other occasion when the good of the service requires it, even though he may leave unsaid many thoughts which he feels are worthy. Clearness of statement and directness of appeal is what the preacher to-day must cultivate if he wants to be a successful shepherd.

And then the pastor must be a leader. The faithful shepherd leads his flock and does not drive them. He must

"Lead to the place where Heavenly pastures grow,
Where living waters gently pass and full salvation flows."

What is a leader in a congregation? When is the pastor a real leader? These are questions not easily answered. I have long come to the conclusion that there is no vocation

anywhere in this world requiring more executive skill and capacity than the successful pastor or shepherd. His flock will not be found in God's green pastures unless he leads them there. But this does not mean that he must be the head of every movement in his congregation; it means exactly the opposite, and that he will be, as far as may be observed from the outside, the leader in very few movements where other leaders are available; but it does mean that he will see that others are trained to lead the various movements in his congregation so that the work may be well and efficiently done in a way pleasing to the Great Shepherd of the sheep.

A great many of our ministers allow themselves to be fretted and worried with details which should be handled entirely by others. The shepherd cannot eat the grass from the green meadows of spiritual refreshment for his members, they must take the nourishment themselves. So in the work of a congregation, no minister can successfully lead his flock without developing, wherever possible, leaders to advance the work in the Kingdom. And the men who rise in the noble calling of the ministry and who are considered successful pastors, are not always the ones who are considered the best pulpit orators. While, as I stated before, the proper preaching of God's word is essential to the successful pastor, yet, unless the preaching is followed by a development of the spiritual life of the congregation, through organization in which the members or the people themselves are made to realize their full responsibility for leadership and service, his preaching will largely be in vain.

As strange as it may seem, sometimes I have known ministers who are actually jealous of the leadership and the ability of some members of their congregations, forgetting that the big, successful wide-awake pastor glories in the achievement of any of his members, and that their development and advancement is but a reflection of the soul of service which he himself possesses. Oh, how the faithful shepherd re-

joices in the fat, sleek, well-groomed sheep; how he looks upon them with pride, the result of his skilful care and training! So the faithful pastor looks with extreme gratification upon the various members of his flock who have been developed under his nurturing care and who are willing to take their places in the various organizations, so that he may feel perfectly comfortable in going away and leaving the service to these trained members of his flock. And this training is not confined to the few. Every member in every congregation, confirmed and unconfirmed, is a subject of training for some kind of leadership; it may be insignificant—it must be in some cases—but it is the kind of leadership that fixes the responsibility upon the individual's soul and heart in such a way that he recognizes the leading of the spirit in the performance of the task which he believes is God-appointed and God-given.

To be a successful leader of his congregational flock requires of the pastor some financial acumen, and above all strict financial integrity and honor. There are many ways in which his fitness for the high office which he holds is tested along these lines. Frequently he is asked by those seeking guidance in investments for his opinion as to the safety of some security. If he is wise, he will either refer the inquirer to someone in whom he has confidence who specializes in investments and securities, or secure very reliable data before venturing to give an opinion of his own. I know nothing so eventually disastrous to the work of a pastor as for him to become too closely involved in the financial affairs and problems of his members. But there are problems of finance and economics pertaining to his personal affairs which he should not, in fact cannot, avoid. All successful men must live within their income, and the preacher is no exception. His personal and financial honor and integrity must be strictly maintained at all hazards, and all forms of speculation (and their name is legion) avoided. The lure of the tempter in regard to these things is much

more enticing than might be supposed, and I personally know of a number of instances where the good, conscientious work of a pastor has been utterly destroyed because of financial ventures made by him, sometimes involving some of his members, which have turned out to be disastrous.

But the financial honor and integrity which must be preserved by the pastor is not alone that which concerns him individually but that which concerns his congregation as such. There are many men in business to-day who would be behind prison bars if they were guilty of some of the gross misapplications of funds of which some of our church treasurers and consistories are guilty, with the full knowledge and consent of the pastors of their congregations. The tendency towards this evil is not always easily discerned. It sometimes makes its appearance in the life of a congregation in a way that, unless the pastor is alert and uncompromising in his attitude against it, the habit of misappropriation of funds will be formed and most fatal results must follow, both to the congregation and to its pastor. In all cases of this kind there is but one course open to the honest, conscientious pastor, and that is a rigid adherence to the principle that every dollar contributed to any cause constitutes a sacred as well as a public trust upon the part of the leaders of the congregation to see that the money is paid with reasonable promptness to the cause for which it was given.

The faithful shepherd must be courageous, not afraid when the storms come, and when the rains descend, and when the lightning crashes. Courage is essential to success in every undertaking; fear is the forerunner of failure. There are a great many pastors to-day who are more or less possessed with fear as to some members of their congregation; they may not admit it, but it is too frequently true. It may be, in fact I think is due, in some cases to a system of calling ministers into our different pastorates. It seems to me that the Reformed Church especially needs some system, some simple machinery, which will enable congregations

who are in search of a minister to find the minister as near as possible best suited to their needs, and also to enable the minister, who desires for any reason to make a change of pastorates, or to advance somewhat, to make the change without advertising the fact or without in any way embarrassing or belittling himself in so doing. I know men to-day who are in the ministry, who are God-fearing, intelligent, conscientious ministers of the Word, who, for fear of offending some member of their congregation more or less influential, hesitate to present the great needs of the Church as it is handed down to them by our higher judicatories. As we all know, it is a great mistake, and is largely because of fear.

"While He affords His aid, I cannot yield to fear;
Though I should walk through death's dark shade,
My Shepherd's with me there."

But the pastor-shepherd may preach the Word of God fluently from the pulpit, may be a man among men, may be a leader, an organizer and an executive, may have courage and practically be without fear, and yet lack one thing in order to be a successful shepherd of the flock, and that is love. Love, as you know, is the greatest of all things; it is greater than the silver tongues of men and all angels; greater than science and understanding of all the mysteries of life; greater than the faith that enables men to rise above all obstacles, yea to remove mountains; greater than sacrifice; it is that something that enables us to understand all men and to know them heart to heart. Oh, the power of the pastor in his congregation and his community when he possesses in its fulness and completeness the love of Christ! This love of Christ will show itself in the work of the Pastor; it will show itself in the joy which he finds in his work, the most worthy compensation which anyone can receive for service rendered. Do all pastors really love their work? Can it be said that the scarcity of young men aspiring to the Gospel ministry is due in any sense to the failure of ministers to

get real joy out of their tasks? As a rule I do not believe it can. There are instances, however, where ministers have told me that they would not advise their sons to become ministers of the Word. These examples are few but in each and every case they reflect an attitude toward the greatest of all callings, the Christian ministry, which is out of harmony with the essential requirements of a successful pastor.

The great problem of the Church to-day is not money or the material things, as badly as these are needed from time to time, but its real problem is men who are willing, because of the love which they have for the Master's Kingdom and for those who are inhabitants of it, to give themselves to a life of service, to make known the unsearchable riches of grace, that men may hear and believe.

"O Love that wilt not let me go,
I rest my weary soul in Thee;
I give Thee back the life I owe,
Thine in Thine ocean depths its flow
May richer, fuller be."

MIDDLETOWN, MD.

VI

SOME FURTHER MEDITATIONS

A. E. TRUXAL

The question overshadowing all others for everyone is: How Shall I be Saved? Or in the words of the young lawyer: what shall I do to inherit eternal life? It is true, persons are generally so much absorbed by the labors and cares of the present life that the question of their salvation is crowded out of consideration; but sooner or later it will force itself upon their attention. It is a question that will not down. It may be dismissed but it will return. There are reasons for this. There is a conviction of immortality in man's soul. He knows that the grave is not the goal of his life. He realizes that although he die yet shall he live. He is also convinced that happiness or misery await him in the life after death, and he wants to know how he may escape the misery—how he is to be saved. He believes that when he passes over he will have to do with God more directly than here, and God is holy and righteous and just. He is conscious that he himself is unholy, unrighteous and unjust—that he is a sinner by nature and practice. How shall he be delivered from the power and results of sin and be saved in the world to come? He is told that Jesus is the savior of men; that He has come to save him; that if he accept Jesus he shall be saved. Jesus will save him: BUT HOW? In my meditations I find this the most difficult and perplexing question of all.

Theologians in past ages have worked out various solutions in answer to this inquiry. The solution which has been generally accepted by the church the past several hundred years is something like the following: God created Adam and Eve good and holy, but they disobeyed God and thereby sinned against Him, and by that act their nature was changed

from holiness to sinfulness, and their descendants partook of their sinful nature. God in consequence was displeased with them and condemned Adam and Eve and all the children of men to death and Hell. Thus it came to pass that the curse of God rests upon all mankind, for all are sinners. Man is unable to make amends for his offence against God. He is small and weak and sinful and God is infinitely great and mighty and holy and consequently the offence is so great that nothing that man could do would satisfy the divine holiness and justice. (Remark. It is assumed that the magnitude of an offence is determined by the greatness of the person offended. But it seems to me that the size and character of the offender determines it. A great man keeps no account of the offences of low, ignorant and depraved persons. But if persons of intelligence and high standing commit the same offences he calls for an accounting). But the argument is that the greatness of God made it impossible for man to do anything that would satisfy the divine mind and heart. Though the record says that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpents head. But God wishing to give man the opportunity of redemption gave His only begotten son to become man and to act as a substitute for His brethren. And He offered Himself on the cross as a sacrifice to God and thereby satisfied divine justice. Being human He could take the place of man and being divine He could satisfy God. Man now is challenged to accept Christ and be saved. In Christ's name he comes to God, is accepted and saved, Christ propitiated God, expiated sin, paid the debt, paid the penalty by dying on the cross and made atonement for man. It seems to me that the Lutheran Theologians are consistent and logical by claiming that Christ not only died on the cross in man's stead but also descended into hell to suffer its torments for man, for he is to be redeemed from death and hell. This is a brief outline of the theory of man's salvation through Christ Jesus. There are so many objectionable features connected with it that

I am not surprised that a late Theologian has designated it as a hocus-pocus arrangement of the Theologians.

There are many subjects that arise out of the scriptures, observation and experience that can be discussed only in a speculative way. But we are likely to be nearer the truth when we consider them in the concrete rather than in the abstract. The character of Adam was originally only potential. In my opinion he was not holy. The first temptation to which he yielded was the manifestation of selfishness and selfishness lies at the foundation of all sin. Neither do I believe that his sin changed his essential nature—that it had been wholly good and now is entirely evil. Nor do I believe that he entailed his evil nature upon his posterity. The evil in parents no doubt affects their children, but so does also the good. But it is not an absolute law, for we are confronted in life with too many exceptions. If alone the evil in parents were entailed upon their offspring, as all parents from the beginning to the present day were sinners in greater or less degree, then the children of men would by this time be altogether bad—very devils indeed. But such is not the case. The old confession that we are corrupt from the crown of our heads to the soles of our feet was a slander which man perpetrated upon himself. I do not believe that physical death is the result of sin; that Adam and Eve and their offspring would have lived on the earth forever if sin had not been committed, or that they would have been translated to another sphere without passing through the dissolution of death. And I do believe that death is an essential factor in all life on earth; that it is necessary for man to go into dissolution in order to be fitted for the next sphere of life which he is to enter—that he must be unclothed in order to be clothed upon again. That in my view belongs to the order of our being and sin has nothing to do with it. But sin has much to do with the purity and righteousness of our character here and with our holiness and bliss hereafter, or perhaps I had better say with the opposite of these condi-

tions. But does not St. Paul teach that death is the result of sin? Does He not connect death with Adam and life with Christ? Yes he does; but I don't know what the Apostle means by death. Does he mean natural death or spiritual death? Biblical scholars have generally construed his words as meaning natural death. But if that be the case then the Apostle evidently did not at the time write by inspiration but by his own knowledge which was no doubt defective on the subject. From the knowledge that has been acquired of the world and of life on earth and from the history of mankind as it has been developed during past ages to the present time I am thoroughly convinced that natural death is an essential factor of human life, and not a punishment for sin. The Heidelberg catechism asks: "Since Christ died for us why must we also die," and answers: "Our death is not a satisfaction for our sin, but only a dying unto sins and entering into eternal life." But I know no facts or demands of logic upon which that teaching is based. It evidently meant to satisfy the perplexity in which the theory of salvation as then held was involved. If physical death is the penalty of sin, and if Christ died on the cross for our sin and satisfied the divine requirement, then we ought to be free of death. The penalty ought not to be paid twice—by Christ for us, then also by us. That is a perplexity which the catechism seeks to remove. But does it? It assumes that physical pain and death will remove sin. Some ancient Christians tried to sanctify their souls by the mortification of their bodies. But the effort failed, for sin holds in the sphere of morals. It is an affection of the soul, and actual sins produce their dire effects upon the soul, not on the body. Therefore I cannot understand how the dissolution of the body can remove the sin from the soul. I do not believe that the person will be magically freed of sin through the article of death; that he dies a sinner and rises a Saint. I will not be surprised to learn in due time that the believer will be under the necessity of purifying himself by the

operation of the Holy spirit in the next world. This purification may be effected through the process of putting on the spiritual body. This is not future probation but a conception of life in the approaching future sphere.

The theory of salvation set forth at the beginning of these meditation misrepresents the attitude of God towards sinful man. It assumes that He was alienated from man, that His wrath rested upon the children of men, that Christ by His death satisfied the divine Justice and reconciled God to mankind. The scriptural facts and teaching however seem to be opposed to this assumption. The earliest records no not sustain the idea. Enoch walked with God and God took him. God blessed Noah and Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and Joseph and Moses and so on down through the ages. That does not look as though God were alienated from men and that His wrath rested upon them on account of Adam's sin. The record however shows that He was displeased when men sinned against Him, when they apostatized, and gave themselves to idolatry, wickedness and vice. Their unrighteousness called forth His displeasure. But when they walked with Him and did good unto their fellow-men He was pleased and blessed them. The entire history of His dealings with the people does not support the thought that the justice of God needed satisfaction or God reconciliation to men. The record does not show that Christ offered Himself as a sacrifice to God for the sins of men. Having perceived the animus and purpose of the Pharisees He informed His disciples that He would be killed by the rulers of the Jews. In the garden He prayed, Father if it be possible let this cup pass from me. St. Peter on the day of Pentecost and St. Stephen afterwards united in arraigning the Jews for having crucified the Messiah. Neither in His own words nor in those of His disciples in Jerusalem is there the slightest intimation that Jesus offered Himself as a substitute for believers. He was submissive to the will of the Father and faithful to His Mission though it cost Him

His life. As St. Paul says in one of His Epistles, He was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have Eternal life. That expresses God's attitude towards men. He did not need reconciliation, but man did. The whole process of revelation had in view not the bringing of God to men but of men to God. Hence we find in the scriptures such words as these: "that he might reconcile them both, (Gentile and Israel) unto God through the cross," that the Father should "through him reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the cross"; "We were reconciled to God through the death of his son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life"; "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself"; "We beseech you on behalf of Christ be yet reconciled unto God." The attitude of man needs to be changed.

There is vicarious suffering. Parents suffer for their children, children for parents, and friend may die for friend. Jesus suffered for His brethren. He died for us, for our salvation. Such vicarious suffering is the expression of a great love—of sympathy and mercy. But *vicarious punishment* is a different thing. To punish one person for the guilt of another would not be just—would not satisfy justice. It would be immoral. The willingness of a person to be punished for the crime of another would not change the character of the transaction. No human judge would for a moment consent to the punishment of an innocent person for a guilty one. The soul that sinneth, it shall die. Such punishment would not affect an atonement—an at-one-ment. One man grievedously offends another for which he ought to make due amends. A mediator takes the obligation upon himself. But that does not change the moral relations between the offended and offender. The only way by which a reconciliation can be effected is by the amends and changed attitude of the offender and the forgiveness of the offended.

Can a man not be freed of his obligation by another paying his debt? In the commercial sphere that can be done. But the purification and salvation of the soul can be brought about alone by moral processes. Harmonious relations between persons can exist only when the state of their souls are harmonized. It is sometimes said that Jesus paid our debt to God. If that be so we now owe it to Jesus. Hence the song:

Jesus paid it all
All to Him I owe.

So we owe it still. But Jesus forgives us. We owed it to the Father, then we owed it to the Son, and now the Father and the Son have forgiven it. But as the Father and the Son are one the mediation of Christ ending upon Calvary's cross amounts to an assurance of our forgiveness.

But here again we must not think of forgiveness in an outward, mechanical or magical sense. God does not forgive the sins of men in their sins. They are challenged to repent of their sins and forsake them, "Go thou and sin no more." Men must change their attitude towards God. They must turn to God to do His will. This at most is but a feeble beginning of walking with God. There will be many relapses, many wayward steps and imperfections through ignorance, weaknesses and provocations but God looks upon them with mercy and forgiveness because of the purpose of their hearts. Their faces are set in the right direction. Not only is there forgiveness for all such but the grace of the Lord is also given through the operation of the Spirit in them to aid them in overcoming the evil and pursuing the good.

In the early church and afterwards the meaning of Christ's life, sufferings, death and resurrection, and the conceptions of salvation through Him, were very much influenced by the Temple Service with its various sacrifices and day of atonement, also by the immolation of animals and human beings on the altar by the heathen to appease

the anger of their Gods, by the unaccountability of sovereign rulers and by "The forms of criminal law and criminal procedure." As a consequence we have to-day yet some crass and materialistic expressions in regard to salvation through Christ, in Theological writings, in sermon and song. Expressions like the following abound. Blood atonement; saved by the blood of Christ; washed in the blood of the Lamb; and similar statements. In the hymn we sing: "There is a fountain filled with blood." Oft I have taken part in singing it and found spiritual pleasure in doing so. Yet when we come to think about it, could there be a cruder and crasser conception than that, than sinners immersed in a fountain of blood!¹ Of course these terms are used metaphorically; but I imagine that many persons employing them would find it difficult to state in clear terms what they really mean by them. Salvation is a spiritual process. Jewish forms and ceremonies and Jewish conceptions are not the key to the meaning of Christ's services and ministry. Judaism does not explain Christianity, but Christianity Judaism. The Gospel casts its light upon the law, not the reverse. The material does not give meaning to the spiritual, but the spiritual reveals the significance of the material. Under the old dispensation much was made of atonement; the word is but once found in the New Testament, Rom. 5:11. The way of Salvation through Christ Jesus must be found in the Gospel; or more specifically is the nature of the life and works and teaching of Jesus.

My meditations have thus far been largely of the nature of destructive criticism. It is necessary to think also constructively on the subject before us. How has Christ saved us, or rather how does He save us? What is the process of the Salvation through Christ Jesus? This is a question over

¹ When Christians sing: "We have heard a joyful sound, Jesus said," they sing the truth. When they sing: "There is a fountain filled with blood," they sing a half-truth which is apt to become superstitious and magical. Rev. A. Boyd Scot in "Nevertheless We Believe," page 65.

which Christian scholars in all ages of the church have prayed and labored and worried; and they have answered it in different ways. Every thoughtful person must think the subject out for Himself, and endeavor to satisfy his intellect, his conscience and his experience. He must consider it not simply in the abstract but also as he sees it in the concrete in the lives of Christians. The thoughts I here record are of a tentative nature. I would not speak dogmatically on the subject. But they represent the apprehensions and conceptions of the way of Salvation that satisfy my mind and heart. We are sinners by nature and practice. God is holy and righteous, merciful and just. A wide and deep chasm separates man morally from God. This chasm is to be removed. They are to be brought together. They are to become harmonized in nature. The original meaning of the word atonement is to be at one, to agree, to be in accord. The son of God became man. In Him the divine and human were harmoniously united. God and man became one. In the incarnation we have the atonement in actuality. Out of the incarnation grew the words and works, the sufferings, death and resurrection of Christ. He did not make an atonement but He was the atonement. How is that atonement to benefit us? How are we to become partakers of it? By becoming like Christ; by partaking of His nature. But how is that to be accomplished? The answer is found in the concrete examples of the apostles and other disciples. They obeyed His command to follow Him, they listened to His words, they saw His life and works, they caught His spirit. Thus they became transformed into His image; but only in a very small way. They were far from perfect. We know how they fled when He was arrested, and when He lay silent in the tomb they resolved to return to their former calling. They were reclaimed by the manifestations of His resurrection from the dead. Matthew left a lucrative position to become His disciple; Zaccheus when He was converted resolved to restore ill-gotten gains and to minister unto the

poor and needy; to the sinning woman He said: Go Thou and sin no more. By these examples of different classes of people we can see how by faith and obedience they became partakers of the Spirit and life of the Lord Jesus. They were set on the way of salvation, though they had only a small beginning at first of the Salvation of Christ. Jesus by his life and deeds exemplified the commandment to love God with the whole heart and to love one's neighbor as himself. And His disciples were to do the same in order to live, and they sought to do so to the best of their several abilities. The assurance of Christ's resurrection revived their faith and hope and the coming of the Holy Spirit inspired them with zeal and courage in preaching and living the gospel. Their devotion to the Lord became strong and abiding and their love and sympathy for one another unbounding as their community of goods revealed. The Holy Spirit in them was their inspiration and strength and the medium for the reception of the grace and help of the Lord. The Spirit was the link which bound them to their risen Lord and gave them comfort. But they were not perfect as was shown by the acts of Ananias and Saphira, by their mistaken hope of the Lord's speedy return and later by the different conceptions held by Saint Peter and Paul in regard to the requirements of the Gospel. But their minds and hearts were definitely fixed to obey and serve the Lord and they relied upon the Spirit in them to enlighten, guide and comfort them. And thus they received the benefits and grace of Jesus Christ the mediator between God and man. And this has been the order of Salvation from the days of the apostles down to the present time. Men were called to repent of their sins, believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and do the will of God with the promise that they would receive the forgiveness of their sins, the grace of the Lord and the guidance of the Holy Spirit who would dwell in them. There is no essential difference between the Salvation of the first Christians and of those of subsequent times excepting

that the former were more thoroughly consecrated to the service of the Lord and as a consequence received a larger measure of divine grace and a fuller guidance of the Holy Spirit. Thus in the concrete lives and services of Christians from the beginning until now we see the Salvation of Christ. They are saved, but are not perfect Christians. All of them have been mere babes in Christ. They only began to be Christians. Like the great Apostle, though not so earnestly, they pressed forward towards the goal. And I cannot believe that death will end the process, but that there will be forgiveness and grace and guidance on the other side which will be met by appropriating effort on the part of the child of God. As before said, I do not believe that we will be sinners in death and saints in resurrection. From life and experience I find no foundation for the faith in such magical transformation. What now has become of Christ and His work? There He stands as the revealer of the nature and will of God; as the perfect exemplar of love to God and love to man. He was faithful and obedient to the Father even unto death; He was faithful to man though it brought Him to the Cross. Our religion rests entirely upon Him. He is the foundation of it all. Take Him away and our religion with all its contents will fall in ruin to the ground. He lived for us; He taught and worked and suffered for us; He died on the Cross for us and He made known His resurrection from the dead for our establishment in the faith. And by our faith in Him and obedience to His Gospel and spiritual communion with Him we receive of His life and spirit into our souls. Well may we sing praises to His name and worship Him! The realization of what He has done for us ought to move us to repentance and faith and holy living. Jesus is our all; all in Him we find. Our Salvation comes from Him. There is no other Salvation for us. Through Christ we realize our filial relation to God and the paternal warmth of His love. This phase of my meditations I will close with the words of Dr. Bowne—words that are worthy

of thoughtful considerations. "The deepest thought of God is not that of ruler, but of Father; and the deepest thought of man is not that of subjects, but of children. And the deepest thought concerning God's purpose in our life is not Salvation from threatening danger, but the training and development of souls as the children of God. Salvation or redemption is but an incident or implication of this deeper purpose, and must be interpreted accordingly. The entire subject must be studied as a relation of living moral persons rather than of ethical and juristic abstractions."²

To the foregoing meditations I wish to add a few thoughts on a different subject, one that is however more or less closely related to the things already discussed. The religion of college students has of late received a good deal of consideration. The complaint is made that many of them lose their faith at the schools. It no doubt is a fact that there are those who at the close of their course are religiously indifferent. There is a cause for this. The young men who returned from the late war were also apparently indifferent towards the church. There was a cause for that. A recent graduate from the University of Michigan wrote on the religion of students in the *Outlook* of September 19, 1923, describing and analyzing the experience of a student who spends four years at such an institution. She wrote intelligently on her observation and experience. The young man faithful and loyal to his church at home enters college, passes through the various courses of study, and then returns home with very different ideas, feelings and convictions from those which he possessed when he entered. He has acquired a broad and tolerant outlook upon the world and human life. The church as he had learned it in his early days now seems to him like a very narrow and intolerant institution. Some of its theories he finds illogical and unreasonable and he no longer believes them. But the life and teaching of Jesus appeal to him very strongly. "He is amazed to dis-

² *Studies in Christianity*, by Borden P. Bowne, page 218.

cover how true and simple the teachings of Jesus really were, and he wonders how the modern church ever wandered so far from reality. He decides after all that there was some foundation for his old beliefs, and that science does not contradict the faith taught by Christ." He further expresses himself. "I never knew what a wonderful world I live in. My whole idea of life is changed. . . . I'd rather evolve out of an amoeba than be built out of mud like a poor statue." The Bible has become a new and interesting book to him and he finds pleasure in studying it. "Before he had never stopped to think how it originated, but felt dimly that it came direct from Heaven through the King James translators." There no doubt is a decided movement among students away from the church. But on the other hand many of them, and many laboring men too, have a stronger faith in Christ and His teaching than they had before. But they do not believe that He and it are properly represented by the church. Because of this condition the fundamentalists may howl at the teaching and influence of the institutions and set themselves up as the stout defenders of God. But that will not remedy the evil; only make matters worse. The remedy is the Gospel preached so that it will fit in with modern knowledge. It must be presented in such form that it will appeal to the intelligence and conscience of the students. The writer for the *Outlook* reports the words of a former pastor who said: "I was filling the church with students, but the older people were withdrawing their support and money." If campus preachers and preachers of churches convenient to the student body will be broadminded and tolerant, and preach the Gospel as Christ preached it, the students will become interested and attend the services; but if they preach the theological theories that have prevailed in the past, ten students will be repelled to one attracted. The unthinking may acquiesce in the statements: "The Bible is infallible in every respect;" "It is the word of God from cover to cover;" but persons who have acquired a measure of modern

knowledge and who can think straight will be injured by such propositions. The message of Charles Stelzle to the working men ought to be given to the students. "Christianity is not dependent upon the infallibility of the church, nor of the Bible. The church and the Bible are simply a means to an end and not an end in themselves. Their purpose is the revelation of God in Jesus Christ." Men and women students cannot evade Christ or the church of the Bible. They must take their stand in regard to them. So must every intelligent man and woman. What they need is a knowledge of the formation of the Bible; information in regard to the circumstances in which the various books of the Bible were written and a knowledge of the history of the formation of the canon. And that will give them new light on the faith in God and the way of Salvation through Christ Jesus. Then they will trust in the Lord and in the way of Salvation. God does not employ a perfect church or a perfect Bible, but such a Bible and such a church as men by the promptings and inspiration of His spirit have worked out. This is God's plan; but some persons are not satisfied with it. They want something different. They want a perfect church and a perfect Bible—something infallible—some external authority upon which they can rest. But alas for them. There are no such things. God's plan no doubt is the best—the best for man and his Salvation. The church, Jesus, the Bible, history, the world, and human experience are full of God and His love, and of the way of Salvation through Jesus Christ. They that trust in the Lord shall never be confounded.

SOMERSET, PA.

VII

AMERICA AT HER BEST

A. C. SHUMAN

I. GOD'S WAY IS THE WAY FOR ALL NATIONS

The evangelization of the world halts because of our disobedience to God and lack of recognition of His authority. We put our feelings in place of the will of the Father. Scores of people do not go and do not act as missionaries because they do not feel called. Multitudes do not give to missions because they do not feel moved. When the Hebrews sang the 67th Psalm, they sang a very natural prayer: "God be merciful unto us and bless us." It was quite right for the worshiping Jews to pray for themselves, for their families and all the members of the Jewish race. But it is a very poor prayer whose climax is a petition merely for a blessing on "us." But the Jews' prayer did not stop with the words "bless us," but looked beyond to the greater good of the other peoples on the earth. The prayer continues. "Bless us, that thy way—God's way—may be known upon earth, Thy Salvation among all nations."

II. GOD ANSWERED THIS PRAYER

God blessed the Hebrew people. By his favor the boundaries of their country were greatly extended. Their fields, vineyards, orchards, flocks flourished. By God's revelation the Hebrews developed the greatest religious literature of the ages, and only second to-day in importance to Christian literature. By the influence of this literature the Hebrews became the most enlightened people morally and spiritually among all the peoples of the ancient world. And so the Jews had a great opportunity to be a blessing to the world, but they neglected it and lost it, and have themselves now become a world problem.

III. THE PRAYER OF AMERICA, GOD'S MODERN SPIRITUAL ISRAEL

"God be merciful unto us—Americans and bless us." God has blessed the American people. He has given us the most favored portion of this healthful North American continent, with its fine climate, rich minerals, forests, fisheries, river system, productive soil; by God's favor and our faith in him we have a civilization that has resulted in our good homes, our schools, factories, stores, railroads, automobiles, electric lights, telephones and the wireless—in fact all. By all counts America is the most favored of all lands to-day.

IV. IS AMERICA TAKING HER MISSIONARY OBLIGATION SERIOUSLY

God has blessed us. Are we now seeking to use these blessings that God's way may be known upon earth? Can we be so selfish as to wish only ourselves to praise the Creator, our Preserver, and Benefactor of all things? Certainly all those who truly delight in praising God themselves must have a passion that others learn of Him and also enjoy the high privilege of praising Him. The devout descendants of Abraham might raise the time of earthly praise to God, but they were not to sing alone. It was not to be a national solo, but a grand inspiring international chorus. This is included in God's program and implied in the process of World-wide Salvation. Christians every where should desire God's praise to be universal. Christian nations should now be practicing the glorious paeon of praise, for the Word of God and the Gospel fruitage of to-day guarantee its final universal sway.

It is true through all generations the world over that blessings received must be transmitted to others. This was difficult for Israel to learn. But that some learned it is evidenced by the magnanimous spirit shown in the prayer of the Israelite in this psalm. True prayer must always be world-wide and universal. How much better it would have

been for Israel had they all realized the divine purpose in their call as a nation, as a spiritual people, for the uplifting and unifying of humanity. Their mission was to show the way of God to all the wayward nations. Their compassion was to run out to all nations in the world. The worship of God through the mediation of the Son of God our only High Priest and Eternal King, is to be set up among all peoples.

But the nations cannot know of that divine grace until messengers of God take it to them in love. It was at this point of the lack of interest and the love for Gentiles that Israel miserably failed. And it is here that the church of the living God, composed of God's modern spiritual Israel, may come short of duty. Will Christian America to-day see that it has been God's purpose in all ages to give the blessings of Salvation to all men? God's program is missionary and the goal is world evangelization. His program calls for the united service of his people, and for the consecration of the earth's wealth to Him who gave it to the race. "It looks up to God in faith and hope for the blessing that will make its recipients a blessing to others from their doorsteps to the confines of the globe." To-day Christian people are to reveal the nature of God and his way to others or else perish from off the face of the earth. The saved must send the news of Salvation to those who have not heard it. This divine program will not be completely carried out until everybody in all lands shall know and love and serve Jehovah. The uplifting and unifying of humanity comes through grace, and through grace only.

The world needs the demonstration of the blessedness of a Christian nation. America to-day holds the balance of power for the world. Because of our liberal institutions and commercial resources we have every reason to believe that she will continue to hold that power. But while America holds these superb claims among the countries of the world, she just as truly must assume the greatest tasks among the world's nations in order to fulfill her obligations to God for

his blessings toward her. And if America uses her power for humanity's welfare, for which she is pledged in her fundamentals and constitution, her power must enlarge with the years.

V. AMERICANS AS WITNESSES

God says now to Americans as he said to the Hebrews, Isa. 43:10-12, "Ye are my witnesses, . . . and besides me there is no Savior." American missionaries, 11,302 of them, who are now out in non-Christian lands are witnesses. But are we to depend on these alone? Will the sending out of these few Missionaries as witnesses fully satisfy the divine obligation resting upon us? God has abundantly blessed us. Are we now seeking to use these blessings in such a commensurate measure that God's way may be known upon the earth? Scarcely a billion minutes have passed since Christ gave his masterly summary of the whole trend and purpose of divine revelation (Matt. 28:19, 20. Mark 16:15) and still there are a billion heathens who have not heard the Gospel. The only missionary text which some folks can quote is the above. For them the whole missionary message of the Bible is contained in these two passages. And these passages are taken to apply to Missionaries alone. But this is not so. The message of the Bible is missionary throughout. Its missionary teaching ends rather than begins with these passages. Unless we see this, the whole missionary enterprise is liable to seem arbitrary and man-made rather than a plan and purpose of God to save the whole world.

It is incumbent upon us as an enlightened Christian people to put Christ into all our activities in our transactions with men and especially in our international contacts and relations.

American Ambassadors and Consuls abroad have a rare opportunity to set good examples as representatives of a Christian country. Col. Buck, former U. S. Minister to Japan, said he was not always a regular church attendant

in America, but in a foreign land he felt it his duty to represent his country rightly by regular church attendance. The captains, and sailors as well, sailing the seas in thousands of ships flying the Star Spangled Banner, have outstanding opportunities to acknowledge Christ as their Lord.

Christian business men are fruitful witnesses. American citizens engaged in the silk business in Shanghai, the representatives of Standard Oil, The General Motors Company, Singer Sewing Machine Company, and many others doing business in foreign lands, as well as our thousands of American Tourists, can, by Christian conduct, by doing their utmost to keep the Sabbath day holy and by brave confession of Christ, be witnesses to the God who has brought America to himself.

But there are many Americas. For instance, there is a political America, according to which everything is measured in terms of party interests and political measures and standards. Political measures lead to imperialism. The final answer of political imperialism is always war. Militarism follows imperialism as night follows day. Political America has not yet after five years of political propaganda, taken its place in the World court for international justice nor proposed a better means for preventing war and building up international coöperation. Political isolation is contrary to the divine program for this world.

Then, there is an economic America, which has its eyes riveted only on "trade advantages to be secured in Asia Minor and the Near East." The Christian Minorities of Asia Minor have been practically obliterated because of the overshadowing presence of economic imperialism. At the Lausanne Conference the private economic interests of the great Powers, important only to a relatively small group of individuals, capitalists and stockholders, those interests which had or hoped to have some investment in Asia Minor, requested their governments to instruct the representatives at the Conference to see that they were fully protected. This

is nothing more nor less than the spirit of conquest expressed in commercial terms. The present chaos is the inevitable result of this. The world is still trembling at the horror of Smyrna.

But there is also an idealistic, a humanitarian, a religious America—and this America is finding magnificent expression in its work of mercy in the Near East. Religious America does not forget its pledges to all civilization in upholding the rights of the oppressed minorities by humanitarian and philanthropic acts, and in protecting the American Christian public investments of \$136,000,000 of Christian America's money which has been invested within the last 100 years in missionary, educational and humanitarian activities especially in the Near East. This is America at her best.

Let us pray: "God be merciful unto us and bless us and cause his face to shine upon us; That they may be known upon the earth, Thy Salvation among all nations."

Are we going to pray through this prayer. Are we willing to act and to do our part in carrying out this prayer in a spirit of sacrifice and service, love and joyfulness. Our religious history constrains us to fulfil this prayer.

VI. HOW GOD HAS BROUGHT AMERICA TO HIMSELF

How has God brought America to himself and prepared her for this serious hour of World Crisis? Always by the influence of Godly men on our ancestors in other lands—in Ireland, Scotland, England, Germany and Scandinavia. The missionary St. Patrick, rising "before daylight for prayer in the woods and mountains, through snow, through frost, through rain" was one of the agencies God employed to bring our Irish fathers back in the fifth century to Himself. The missionaries, Vivian and Columba, by carrying the Gospel to our Scotch parents about 400 A.D. also helped to bring America to God. Willibrood and Boniface, who helped to evangelize Denmark and Holland and Germany,

were helping to make a later America, Christian. Luther, Calvin, John Knox, the Wesleys, Whitfield, Asbury, McCosh, Myers, Morgan, Jowett, and Horton and hundreds of others have all been human instruments employed in bringing the European ancestors of Americans to God.

Within our own borders God has used great multitudes of faithful men and women, godly parents, Christian business men, Sunday-school teachers, Christian school and college teachers, pastors, editors, Christian government officials, national prosperity and adversity, national joys and sorrows—all these and more that could be mentioned to bring America to Himself.

VII. IS AMERICA TAKING HER STEWARDSHIP OBLIGATION SERIOUSLY

1st. A Warning. God is an ever faithful witness to his word and promises of Grace. God did all that his grace could do to bring Israel to himself in order that Israel might be his channel of blessing to the World. Babylon had a good measure of light from her devout Hebrew captives for her great day of world opportunity. So had Assyria, Persia and Greece. Rome had more light and the greatest opportunity of all to be God's messenger to the World. All these nations, because they worshipped *power and wealth* and sought *things* for themselves, have dropped out of the world's serious consideration.

In 1918 the Allied armies won the war on the battlefield. Germany started the war, a war of political and economic imperialism, and the Allies concluded that war but not the fighting. Every ideal that men had suffered for through four long years has been swept aside in the forcible substitution of the economic interests of one nation for those of another. If the statesmen who negotiated the peace had considered the war in the same terms as the men who fought it the world would be safe for—Christian—democracy."

But political and economic imperialism at Versailles

cheated the armies of the fruits of their victory. Hence, France has been swaying between bankruptcy and revolution, Russia and Germany are dying by inches, England overtaxed and hard pressed, Greece prostrate and betrayed, Italy defiant and uncertain, Austria depleted, the Armenians and Asiatic Greeks—Christian minorities—massacred or deported, Turkey arrogant and triumphant, and the United States of America, powerful, but standing bewildered in an attitude of isolation, in the midst of perishing multitudes.

2d. Are we going the way of the Jews?—The American army previous to 1914 was not a large army, and the people did not feel the maintenance as a great burden. The cost of the army during the nineteenth century was approximately \$9,500,000,000. That sum would have maintained a staff of 95,000 missionaries in the Foreign fields of the world every year of the century.

The profits of the United States Steel Corporation—just one company for one year was six times as much as the entire missionary offerings in the four leading Protestant countries, America, Canada, England and Germany.

The income of one American life insurance company was greater than all the missionary treasuries of the world.

In the year 1900 there were at least \$23,000,000,000 in the possession of American Christians. They gave of that amount to foreign missions, one fourth of a tithe of a tithe of a tithe. There is plenty of proof that Americans, Christian Americans, are seeking automobiles—300,000 per month—shows, confections, cosmetics, jewelry and what not.

According to Dr. Carroll, statistician, all the churches of every demonination in this country reported for all home expenses, benevolences and foreign missionary work for 1922 the sum of \$488,424,000.

The moving picture industry, with the biggest profits on Sunday, reports that for 1922 there were \$600,000,000 paid admissions to the picture shows. Now it does matter out of

whose pockets—church members or otherwise—this money came, it is God's money. But is it being spent in the right proportion? At least the cold fact stares us in the face that the people of this country spend \$100,000,000 more of God's money for movies—one form of amusement alone—than they do for the evangelization of the world.

3d. The Remedy.—America at her best, giving the Gospel message in dead earnest to all the world. America has the greatest training for controlling the world's highest welfare and destinies; the greatest prospect as a world benefactor; the greatest prospects for moral, commercial and industrial advancement: from an intellectual and spiritual view point, America is most able to help Christianize the world. Viewed from this angle America must *hold* the first claim for complete Christianization in order to evangelize other nations. As a nation, by drafting just and sometimes generous treaties, by using her powerful influence to discredit war and armaments, by enforcing Sunday observance and her laws in regard to alcoholic poison and opium, America can be just now God's greatest witness in the earth.

TIPPIN, OHIO.

VIII

SOCIOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS

A. ZIMMERMAN

While reading Professor Vollmer's book entitled *New Testament Sociology* I came across several passages which drew my attention, and set me to thinking, in an unusual degree; partly because of the importance of the passages and partly because there is abundant room to differ from the author. Preconceptions in theology will modify one's sociological positions unless one is exceedingly careful to steer clear of former conceptions and make an independent investigation. And even then it may be next to impossible. It may be a question whether one should approach New Testament Sociology, or general sociology, from the standpoint of religion and theology or make an independent investigation in sociology and, if there be any carrying over of previously entertained opinions, carry them over into theology. It is impossible to draw clear cut boundaries and limit each study within its prescribed limits and say to the others, Do not trespass. Theology, religion, ethics, and sociology overlap and modify each other to such an extend that we must look at the field as a whole in the study of each.

I. CLASSIFICATION

During this reading I was more forcibly impressed than ever with certain conceptions of theology, religion, ethics, and sociology as well as their interrelations. It is difficult to conceive the Christian religion without either a theology or a sociology; so it is also difficult to conceive theology apart from religion and sociology; but it is just as difficult to conceive an adequate sociology from the theistic standpoint divorced from religion, theology and ethics. There may be wided variations as to the conceptions of these relations. We may differ as to the point where the main emphasis is

to be placed, or even in our system of coördinating and subordinating them either in their entirety or in regard to the various topics treated. We may view religion from the standpoint of theology or that of sociology; or we may view sociology from the viewpoint of theology or religion; or we may treat theology from the standpoint of religion or of sociology. The viewpoint will determine the system of classification. While within the bounds of dogmatics recent writers have broken loose from the beaten paths of scholastic theologians, the system of classification of former days remains very much intact. It seems to me that it is about time to reconstruct our system of classification as well as religion, of which we have been hearing so much. Why not treat these various subjects from the viewpoint of functioning in the process of building up the Kingdom of God as interpreted by Christ? He has given us the largest conception of the field and the noblest conception of man as well as the widest conception of relations. The question is whether we can lay aside our preconceived views to a sufficient extent to calmly reconstruct the entire program. But it must be remembered that man is the sphere of functioning as well as one of the elements that function, whether we regard man as an individual or as a social group.

Professor Vollmer begins his work by reminding us that "New Testament Sociology is the second subdivision of the New Testament on religion," stating in parenthesis that the first subdivision is New Testament Theology. On page 16 he tells us that "it has been said that there is more material for a sociology than for a theology in the Bible." He does not qualify this statement and we may assume that he fully approves the idea expressed. But why class sociology as the second subdivision if the book on which both theology and sociology depend for their material gives most prominence to sociological matter? Is there not possibly a fundamental reason for this predominance of the social factor?

Is it not true that any functioning must have a sphere in

which to function? Is it not furthermore true that no functioning is complete until it legitimately controls the sphere within which it is to function and thus fully meets its purpose? Now we cannot properly ascribe social functioning to the sphere of either theology or religion, but we can ascribe theological and religious functioning to the sociological sphere. This is why the source from which New Testament Sociology draws its material is so thoroughly saturated with social ideas, and also why one is everywhere confronted with the social relations. But it should furthermore be said that theology and religion, as well as ethics, are unthinkable without a sphere within which to function and that the nature of this functioning depends on the nature of the relations existing.

We believe in a personal God. We believe not only that God can but that He actually does reveal Himself to man. This self-revelation of God must be of a personal nature or character, and it must come within the comprehension of man. Man comprehends with his intellect. No self-revelation of God can reach man except through his intellect as an integral part of his personality. But not only is there an approach from God to man, there is also an open avenue leading from man to God. Both are personal beings and have a capacity for mutual understanding. Social relations must exist between man and God. In fact we must predicate sociability to God as well as to man. God and man meet on a social basis, but this social relation must also be of a high order. The interchange of thought between man and God must be based on these social relations and capacities. Whatever God wishes to reveal to man He does within the sphere of man's social capacity to comprehend and assimilate. Outsided of this there is no approach to man. Man's intellect and sensibilities, or his capacity to receive communications from any source whatever, lie within the limits of his social life. While the intellect functions outside of social life, it is nevertheless impossible to conceive man as

thinking were he not a social being. New Testament Sociology must therefore include God if it is to include all rational social beings who communicate with man. A new factor is thus introduced into its scope, but the new factor brings with it an enlarged view of the sacredness of all social relations because of the sacredness of all social relations because of the sacredness of personality. This both widens the scope of sociology and enriches it. Social relations must no longer be regarded as profane but distinctly and positively sacred.

Thus sociology furnishes us the sphere within which theology, religion and ethics must function. Not only is the scope of sociology enlarged but it also becomes basal. Even dogmatic theology is thus deprived of its independent character. It becomes tributary to social science. This scheme of classification calls for a reconstruction of our sociological and religious conceptions. Religion becomes fundamentally sociological both in its relation to God and man. This is why the fullness of God enriches the human soul. It also furnishes the reason why we must regard religion immensely practical and active, not static as if it were motionless in the human soul, having only a beneficent influence over the individual. We doubt whether such a thing as a strictly individualistic religion is possible. A sociological religion is capable of regenerating society because it embraces the whole sphere of social relations, divine and human, of God and man; and it is also capable of elevating man into the most intimate relation with God, both in this life and in that life which is to evolve out of the present order of things.

Thus placing sociology as fundamental and sociological relations as basal we are ready to reconstruct our conceptions of the tributary studies to bring them into line with this conception. Theology appeals to the intellect, shapes our thinking about God and expresses itself in our social activities. Ethics also appeals to the intellect, enriches our

conception of right, duty, and obligation as individuals in the social group, as well as in group relations. Religion appeals to the emotions and expresses itself in worship as to the Godward side and in sacred fellowship in its manward aspect. These all are enriched by reflex influence growing out of their functional relationship in social life and because of their functioning the appeal of God to man is strengthened and social relations clarified. God is no longer to be regarded as merely an outsider trying to find a way in but an insider trying to find means by which the noblest possibilities of man may find expression in life. He is ever active in the redemptive process, but active as superior to human relations and personalities.

II. THE KINGDOM OF GOD

In sections II, III, and IV of Chapter VIII some important aspects of the Kingdom of God are discussed. It is interpreted as always present, as constantly unfolding, and as still coming. It seems to me that these conceptions taken as a whole are somewhat jarring, especially when individually emphasized. We cannot escape these three notions altogether, and yet should we admit more than that the Kingdom is coming in the same sense as we admit that time is coming? All we can know of the Kingdom of God is that with which we are definitely related and that phase with which we can have experience. Time to be is beyond our comprehension but time that is comes within our experience and it is this that relates us to God, to Christ, and to our fellow men. The Kingdom coming makes no appeal to us except in so far as it relates itself to our going. Yet if we are in the Kingdom of God as it is and as it is unfolding in the ever-shifting present, we need not worry about what may come. God's appeal comes to us as beings living in the present, and the important problem of life is to redeem the present time, buy it out, every inch of it, fill it with expressions of holy relations, thoughts, acts. The Kingdom of God

can only appeal to us in our ever-present power of comprehension and in our ever-present social relation to other social beings. Hence here is where we are to place the main emphasis on that social organism which Christ calls the Kingdom of God, and it is naturally to be viewed as ever-present and at the same time as ever unfolding. But it seems to me that the idea of ever-coming as concomitant with ever-present needs no special emphasis.

We study the past history of the Kingdom of God as it has impressed itself upon the minds of men and expressed itself in the unfolding process. We note a neverceasing unfolding of a great plan. Our relation, however, to that Kingdom in its unfolding lies within the ever-present. We express ourselves in relations and attitudes. We relate ourselves through expressions. These have value for the present supremely, and only for the future in so far as they add force to the redemptive current. When Christ speaks of duties and obligations, of privileges and opportunities He places these within the limits of moral obligations, and they are limited to the time when they reach the soul, the present. We have no obligation to the past but to study it without bias and to procure our timber thence, in so far as the past furnishes it, for the structural work of the present. This is imperative. Yet we must often discard timber that was once considered very valuable as useless because the unfolding of the Kingdom has revealed its defects to us. It will not endure the strain. We must gather better material out of the present; we cannot out of the future.

Hence we may so interpret the statements of Jesus that He meant the Kingdom to consist of a social order in which righteousness and holiness prevails, in which the individual functions to the advantage of the mass, in which also the *great objective* ever is to prevent sin and its concomitant suffering rather than the forgiveness of sins, much as we must emphasize forgiveness as long as there is transgression. Here lies the two-fold relation of Christ to the social order.

(1) He has placed before us such a high conception of life and social relations so as to restrain us from doing anything which hinders the growth of the Kingdom—commit sin. (2) He has placed forgiveness at our disposal wherever and whenever we commit sin. Emphasize the latter and you minimize the dwarfing and blighting influence of sin. The development of the Kingdom is halted and the unfolding retarded. Emphasize the former and you stress purity in all social relations and the life of Christ becomes an appeal to the soul to step in line with the onward marching army of the Lord of Hosts. All this emphasizes the fact that our supreme obligation lies in our properly functioning in the ever-present Kingdom. When we awake to this realization we will make whatever adjustments are required that the ideals may be realized. Then, too, we will more fully appreciate that the Kingdom for which Jesus stands is supremely an ever-present Kingdom. The ever-coming and the ever-going are mere incidentals.

III. CHRISTIANITY AND HUMAN NATURE

On page 79 Professor Vollmer makes the following statement: "Christianity has no sympathy with any philosophy which denies the possibility of change in human nature." It is rather unfortunate that we are obliged to use words in so many different senses, especially when they mean opposites. This sometimes leads to confusion. It is often best to take time to define the meaning of words or indicate in which sense a term of this type is used. The phrase "human nature" is one of these terms. It is often used to designate what it says, and sometimes to designate what it does not say. Does our author use the term in the sense in which we usually use it when we speak of the nature of a thing or being? Or does he use it in reference to manifestations or expressions or actions involving a choice? In the latter case it is not correct thinking to apply the term "human nature," because it involves a confusion and one thing is made to

stand for another, which is quite different. Thus when a child cries and acts rather frantic we say it is natural for the child to act mean. It is natural for the child to cry. It is natural to keep on crying and increase in intensity, because there is something wrong that can be remedied. The child may have pain of some kind. A pin may prick it. Crying is the child's language to ask for relief. But to attribute meanness to the child when it refuses to be quieted until the cause is removed, displays ignorance. There is no more moral element involved in the child's persistent crying than in the attendant persisting that there is nothing wrong with the child, that it is naturally mean, possibly not so much. These two senses should not be used indiscriminately for they stand for entirely different conditions.

If Christianity postulates a change in human nature we are obligated to assume that redemption is not a moral proposition, but one involving a change in the natural make up of the individual and the race. In this case there must have been a time when the individual had a certain nature by virtue of which a certain series of acts were performed, then a change so radical came about that this series of acts could no longer be performed but under stress of that changed nature quite another series of acts *had* to be performed. What is done under stress of nature cannot involve guilt. Salvation under a theory of change of nature must involve that change, no more and no less. As soon as the nature has been brought to its former status, so soon will a different course of conduct appear, and that spontaneously, because every being acts according to its nature. And we fail to see where the death of Christ can have any remedial effect on the sinner, if it is supremely a question of nature. But evidently this is what Professor Vollmer intends to teach, namely, that human nature has suffered a change in past history and that salvation involves primarily the restoration of the original nature. But we fail to connect this conception vitally with the bulk of the doctrine he teaches

in his sociology. If this position is correct, then the remedy which is to be used in the transformation of the social order is simply to effect the change of the natures of the individuals and the entire process of salvation is complete, because a change of nature carries with it a change of conduct.

On the other hand if we view man as having erred in misusing a gift we have an entirely different problem to solve. In this case the trouble lies in the fact that man had the optional course of conduct at his disposal, whether he *willed* to be obedient or *willed* to transgress. The battle is waged in the domain of volition, of choice. Now the problem is to bring man back to will to do right and accept eternal life as his portion, not as a result of nature, but as a result of persistent and continued choices. This was the original problem. This is the problem Christ faced both in His life and His death.

It is true that every sin weakens the elements involved in a choice. The more our lives are spent in choosing a certain line of thought as the field in which we delight to revel the harder it is to make a change, or to choose the opposite. But we question very much the wisdom of calling this "nature." It may be questioned whether these weaknesses can be inherited. There is no question, however, as to the reality of the fact that stares us all in the face that our posterity is weaker or stronger than we are according as we force them to live in a devitalizing environment, or in an environment that is supremely energizing to the soul. And there is no question, further, that the one vitalizing element needed to bring about better environments for future generations is a greater sense of God's presence and a better understanding and appreciation of the redemptive life of Jesus Christ. Here we have access to a higher motive that urges on a better choice. And this is the reason why we need to emphasize more the preserving influence of the cross of Christ. If we could better grasp the idea of God's eternal love toward man, the echoing love of man would be

a strong motive towards putting forth choices that bring man's moral acts ever into more complete harmony with God. We would then realize that the redemptive process is operative in the same ratio as he puts forth volitions that bring us in such a vital relation to God in Christ that He keeps us from evil. Such a thought-process is not conducive to the cultivation of self-conceit or vanity, but leads both to a true humility and a trustful dependence on divine power. Christ so interpreted the Father that He stands pictured before our eyes as a rock on which we may rely and a power that is at all times available to keep us from sinning. This is the problem Christ came to solve. And wisely did He solve it. We need reconciliation because our sins estrange us from God. But we need just as much to know that the hand of the Master takes hold upon us when our wills begin to weaken and when our nerves, so to say, begin to give way and when without that appealing power our volitions would go wrong. Has Christianity more sympathy with the doctrine of changeable human nature than it has with motives, volitions involving moral action?

If Christianity has any practical bearing on the lives of men that meaning must lie in the process of conforming our thinking and living in this social environment to the thinking and living of Christ so that the evolving process will eventually lead to the transformation of the present social order into that ideal order known as the Kingdom of God. That Kingdom is imbedded in the present order of things and we can choose our environment to such an extent that our thinking and living are within the processes which are working out the active principles of that Kingdom. Human nature is adapted to the working out of all that is fundamental to Christianity. But we must yield ourselves to the noblest capabilities of our being. Christianity has no quarrel with human nature. It comes to human nature with a mighty appeal, asking that it so unfold itself under the invigorating influence of Christ that there may be an ever-

dying of the abnormal outreaches in order that there may be an ever giving of birth to the normal outreaches of the soul. The normal outreaches of the soul consist in the hungering and thirsting after righteousness, the thirsting after God as the hart pants after the waterbrook.

IV. WHERE THE DANGER LIES

On page 85 we read: "In Matthew 18:15 Jesus intimates that the test of true brotherliness is that I am more disturbed by the wrong that I do to my fellow-man than by the wrong that I suffer from him."

This conception cannot be too strongly emphasized. It is vital to social regeneration. It is vital to healthy religious thinking. But it is also vital to the development of personal character. When Christ said that the Kingdom of God is within us He enunciated the same principle. The thoughts we harbor shape our attitude towards others and are the fabric that determines our being and in its expression we help shape the lives about us. We may to a large extent escape the thinking of others and their expressed attitude towards us, but we cannot escape our own thoughts nor can we avoid their depraving influence, if unwholesome, on others. The wrong we do is a vital part of ourselves. And so we cannot avoid the devitalizing effect on our own character. When the teaching of Jesus so grips us and so fascinates us that we will guard the thoughts within and the relations without, a new era in the process of the regeneration of the world will be inaugurated. Jesus will then become a living personality and an ever-present reality and the reign of love will be more effectively felt.

We should further notice that what we really are, as we behave habitually toward others, is what counts in the shaping of the world's thinking. We contribute to the world's thinking and living through our own experiences with the world and through the experiences of others in their relations with us. Deficiency here is vital, both from a personal

point of view and from the viewpoint of the world's life. We are saving ourselves by saving others. Personal salvation is hardly thinkable apart from our connection with social or world salvation. A failure at that end, has a reflex influence at this end. A failure to coöperate is of importance because of the issue involved. We must always bear in mind the importance of the Christ *with us*. Christ-likeness does not so much lie in a willingness to "make up" as in a readiness to take the initiative. It is deplorable that so many are wounded, but it is sad in the extreme that so many wound without realizing the mischief that is wrought.

V. IGNORANCE AND LIBERALISM

"Political, economical and religious conditions as found in all rogressive countries . . . are explainable, not so much on the theory of total depravity, as on that of woeful ignorance, even on the part of the educated classes, page 94. "Liberalism primarily is not so much a particular set of opinions, but a matter of the spirit in which men regard God, truth, and their fellow-men," page 95.

I am inclined to think that Professor Vollmer has here said more from the standpoint of sociology than he may be willing to admit from the standpoint of theology. At any rate it is sometimes best not to press theology too far in order to let our cooler judgment have sway in other realms. We are too much inclined to inject ideas into theology not germane to the subject and then get color blind where we should have a clear vision. There are a few forms of thought current in theology which are so overloaded that it is difficult to see how they can bear up under the burden. Among them are "human nature" and "total depravity." Thought seems to glide down the snowtrodden track so easily that neither push nor pull is required, no matter how heavy the load. And we still keep on piling up, partly because we are in the habit and partly because it is so easy. When we meet with "knots" and fail to disentangle them

we place the whole business on "total depravity" and complacently think the problem solved. Dr. Vollmer here points to another possible solution. He tells us that people do not do things because of "total depravity" but because they are ignorant, even if they are seemingly, or in reality, educated. The offered solution is not only plausible but often works like a charm. He is right in attributing the cause of a great many evils to ignorance, and we may add, to that "spirit in which men regard God, truth, and their fellow-men" as a result of their being "afraid of ideas, especially new ones, and disinclined to think," and here we may add, *along unbeaten paths*.

Suggested remedies for human ills are legion. Many of them are the result of superficial thinking. Superficial thinking no more dispels ignorance in sociology or economics than in religion or theology. Most problems are not thought through. Problems are not always considered in their entirety. Here is where the trouble lies with much of the so-called liberalism and conservatism alike. Much of what is branded as liberalism is thought-conveyance without content. It neither takes cognizance of the wide field of the needs of man, the manifold relations among men, nor of the relations of God to men in regard to their need and in regard to the resourcefulness of God to meet these needs. On the other hand much of what is called orthodoxy is mere dead rubbish of past ages. So long as orthodoxy limits its thinking to the bounds set by ecclesiastical decrees of centuries gone by when conditions for delivering an infallible judgment or canon, or law was no more favorable than at present and when minds were as liable to err as they are now, and when the thinking of individual men was no more under the influence of the divine spirit than at present, they will get nowhere. Constantly appealing to the past has never brought liberty of thought, has never pointed man to the fullness of life, has never led man to view life as a whole, but has always given man a narrow vision, and con-

tracted his thinking. If ignorance is to be dispelled we must cultivate true liberalism, and enter into hitherto unexplored regions of thought and bring out things both old and new. We must venture to think in unfrequented channels and learn to discover and apply new laws and new associations. These of course lead to new conclusions. The main issue between Christ and the orthodoxy of His day lay in the attitude both toward the past and the present, as well as towards man and God. The orthodoxy of Christ's day was not sufficiently tolerant to fall in line with the liberal thinking of Jesus. He upset too many of their doctrines and refused to be tied down to the decisions of the fathers and elders, to whom constant appeal was made in favor of the validity of their thinking. He upset the pedestal of their authority by simply brushing it aside. He set up new standards of thinking and living. The older conceptions of that time remained master in the situation that arose, and Christ was crucified. But the newer thinking has dominated the ages since where the message of the cross has been heralded and where the new spirit of culture and refinement has had unlimited sway, and where the spirit of Jesus has had full sway men have fled the bondage of the letter and have accepted the liberty of the spirit of Jesus which has always acted to set men free. It is certainly a question whether the conception of Christ and the deliverance He brought as held by the scholastic theologians and contained in the deliverances of councils is more correct than the Jewish conception of the Messiah in the days of Jesus. Certain it is that the former is scarcely more tolerant than the latter was.

It seems to us that the Jews had as good a right to appeal to the authority of their fathers as we have to appeal to the authority of our fathers. If the Jewish council was inerrant in establishing the Old Testament Canon, or even in recognizing parts of it, why should they not be infallible in their other decisions, or at least in some of them? Then who is

to decide where that infallibility begins and where it ends? Who is to set bounds to the validity of decrees as to their applicability? In these days appeals are made to an infallible canon established by infallible councils. Appeals are made to bulls issued by an infallible Pope. If we believe in the infallibility of an ecclesiastical council it is only a little stride to believe in an infallible Pope. If we do not believe in an infallible council, what becomes of the infallible canon? Can the fallible produce the infallible? Here are lines of thought which need careful analysis and thorough investigation. They are important for the New Testament sociologist as well as for the theologian. The spirit in which we approach a subject is of the highest importance. Here lay the distinguishing element between conservative and liberal thinking. Dr. Vollmer well points out that this difference is not in tenets, but one of spirit. If Jesus was right when He promised the Spirit's guidance "into all truth" it is a matter of supreme importance to deny that Spirit's functioning and deny the validity of new thinking and new ideas. A proper attitude toward God, truth, and their "fellow men" must be one of receptivity and openmindedness. It must be a willingness to be led into all truth by the Spirit sent by Christ for that very purpose. And it is as important to approach the sociological subjects from this standpoint as those pertaining to soteriology. The spirit of approach is supreme. If we are at one in this we can well afford to differ in the results secured. If our approach is in the Spirit our conclusions must be valuable though fallible.

In all of these investigations we must admit the fallibility of the human mind. But we need the stimulus arising from new achievements, and it is certainly stimulating to be guided by the Spirit in our quest after a fuller and enlarged conception of truth, that ignorance may be dispelled and an ever brighter light made to shine on the pathway of life. Here is the setting forth of high ideals after which we strive. These ideals must not be static but dynamic. And

if man "needs the dynamics of religion to make him act according to his ideals," does he not much more need the dynamics of Jesus Christ to make him think up to, and according to, His ideals? In this spirit it should certainly be true that "it is entirely possible to teach the sciences . . . from the most advanced point of view without insinuations or direct attacks on religion or the Bible . . . and without unsettling a student's faith in religion or making him indifferent to moral ideals."

It might be said in conclusion that after reading this book we are not surprised at the wealth of sociological material the author has gathered from the New Testament, but we are seriously inclined to ask, Is there any material left for a theology? Certainly the author took a wise course in this thorough investigation of the sources afforded by the New Testament writers, even if his New Testament Theology should be reduced to a very small compass.

NEWTON FALLS, OHIO.

IX

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS

The Teachings of Jesus. A Source Book for the Study of The Teachings of Jesus in Its Historical Relationships. By Ernest DeWitt Burton. The University of Chicago Press. Pages 274. Price \$2.

Source-books have become indispensable aids to students and teachers. And all biblical scholars are deeply indebted to Professor Burton for this notable addition to their equipment. Since the publication of *The Teaching of Jesus* by H. H. Wendt, each passing year has brought us its full quota of similar books. But none like this has appeared. And into the making of it have gone, not merely the wide and thorough scholarship which have given the author a deservedly high place in the realm of New Testament studies, but also his sympathetic insight into the ideals and ideas of the world's greatest teacher. The great need of such a book has long been felt. And the reviewer feels confident that none of the many contributions to critical and constructive scholarship from Professor Burton's pen will receive a heartier welcome or render a greater service than this Source Book. No serious student of the ideals of Jesus will knowingly deprive himself of this unique aid in his investigation.

The volume has been prepared "to present the material, both of Jesus' own teaching and, for purposes of comparison, of that of his contemporaries, in a convenient form, which should economize the student's time and enable him to concentrate all his attention on the task of interpretation and organization." All that, and much more besides, the reader will find in this book. The "Introduction" forms a valuable part of the whole. It discusses clearly and concisely the general questions and issues involved in the study of the teachings of Jesus. Those familiar with the writings of Professor Burton need not be told that the spirit

of this discussion is thoroughly fair and absolutely frank. Here we find a summary statement of the conclusions of the world's most competent scholars concerning the biblical reports of the teaching of Jesus.

The chapter-headings of the body of the book are The Presuppositions and Basal Elements of Jesus' Teaching; Personal Religion and Ethics; The Privileges and Duties of Men; The Kingdom of God; Jesus; The Future. A well-chosen Bibliography is appended. These main topics merely suggest the rich content of the book. But they touch the core of Jesus' Teaching, and each of them has many vital sub-divisions. Under each separate heading, Professor Burton presents the Johannine Teaching, The Synoptic Teaching, The Views of Jewish Writers (Non-Palestinian, Palestinian), The Teaching of Jesus, Modern Literature.

Professor Burton's book requires no specific recommendation. The world of scholarship will hail it as a unique and indispensable addition to its scientific equipment.

Is God Limited? By Bishop Francis J. McConnell. The Abingdon Press, New York. Page 297. Price \$2.

The title of this book raises a question that has been widely discussed in recent years. Many causes have conspired to disturb men's complacent faith in the omnipotence of God. Our age is skeptical of absolutism in any form. Its science and philosophy magnify the relativity of all the facts and forces of the universe. What, then, becomes of God in such a universe? How fares our traditional conception of the Deity with his full panoply of metaphysical attributes—omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence?

Those who feel the force of such questions (and their number is steadily growing larger) may well be directed to Bishop McConnell's book. It is the least technical and the most practical discussion of a difficult issue. There are three main divisions, dealing successively with the limitations of God in relation to the physical universe, in relation

to the world of men, and in relation to himself as a divine personality. There is not an obscure sentence in the whole book, nor an unintelligible thought, nor a conclusion that does not commend itself to an enlightened Christian theism.

The author faces the whole issue with an engaging frankness. He realizes that, at more points than one, the question of the divine omnipotence runs into unfathomable mystery. The old fantastic notion of a "Heavenly Hercules" he gladly consigns to the mausoleum of theological mummies. And he sees clearly that men believe in God, the Father Almighty, not because they can prove His existence scientifically or metaphysically, but because they need Him for the satisfaction of their inner needs and for the realization of their highest good.

The author is at his best in the second part of his book, where he turns from metaphysics to the personal and social dealings of God with created men. In this wide realm of practical religious experience (including prayer, revelation, forgiveness, human nature, the Church, war, racial antipathies, the social question, immortality) the reader will find much evidence to confirm his faith in the rule of a God whose limitations are the expression of His moral and rational nature. It is a thought-provoking, soul-satisfying volume. On page 104, the printer's legerdemain turns Josiah Royce into "Bryce."

How To Read The Bible. Incorporating the Bible at a Single View. By Richard G. Moulton. Pages 133. Price .80 cts. The Macmillan Company, New York.

Down Through the Ages. The Story of the King James Bible. By Frank E. Gaebelein, A.M. Pages 106. Price \$1. The Macmillan Company, New York.

The first of these two little books on the Bible is the twenty-fifth and final volume in the small volume edition of the Modern Readers' Bible. The author, Professor Moulton of the University of Chicago, is the pioneer in the modern literary study of the Bible. His many writings have

been of incalculable value in commanding the Bible to the intelligent attention and interest of modern men. College men, especially, have been led into an appreciation of the Bible as a well-spring of life through Dr. Moulton's guidance.

This final volume worthily concludes the small volume edition. It contains six chapters dealing with general aspects of Bible-study. The headings are, Loss of the Literary Form of the Bible in Ancient Manuscripts and Its Modern Recovery; The Bible as a Book and the Bible as a Library; The Whole Bible at a Single View; Bible Classics; The Reading of Particular Books of Scripture; Reading Applied to the Grand Divisions of Scripture; The Law and the Prophets, The Books of Wisdom, The Gospels and the New Testament; Detailed Scheme for Reading the Bible as a Whole.

These topics tell their own tale. They are sensible, reliable landmarks pointing the way into a worth-while exploration of the Book praised by all and read intelligently by the few. The scope of this little book's usefulness is not limited by age or group. Its mission is universal. But none better could be put into the hands of young people in home and school.

The second volume noted above is from the pen of Frank E. Gaebelein, Principal of the Stony Brook School for Boys. It deals with the story and history of our English Bible from its beginnings in Greek manuscripts to the King James version. The book contains much that is commendable. It is full of information about the Bible that is not readily accessible to adolescent youth. And it is all clearly told and crisply put.

But the book is sadly marred by the author's unhistorical and untenable conception of the nature of inspiration and revelation. Thus, *e.g.*, he holds that "Moses writes over and over again of the Messiah" (p. 92). Boys who are taught such biblical lore in preparatory schools must forget

or unlearn much that they have learned, lest they lose faith in the Bible.

The World's Living Religions. An Historical Sketch. With Special Reference to their Sacred Scriptures and in Comparison with Christianity. By Robert Ernest Hume, Ph.D., Professor of the History of Religions, Union Theological Seminary, New York. Pages 298. Price \$1.75. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

This is the latest volume in the notable Life and Religion Series, edited by Professors Frank K. Sanders and Henry A. Sherman. The professed aim of this series is to prepare "concise handbooks for those who, either as individuals or in colleges, in community schools of religion, or in Bible classes, desire a proper foundation for the more detailed Study of the Bible or of related Subjects." The book of Professor Hume meets this high aim in a most admirable manner. The author proves himself to be a very helpful guide through a labyrinth of facts, and an interpreter of the great religions of mankind whose wide spiritual sympathies are matched with a keen discernment of the ultimate values found in the religion of Jesus Christ. There are many similar books for professional students of comparative religion. But, for the needs of thoughtful lay readers, this volume holds a unique place. It presents the amazing variety of man's religious life in a manner that is scholarly and yet popular, in the best sense. All technical details are omitted in the text, but well-chosen references in the appendix may be followed for a more thorough study and mastery of the subject.

A glance at the table of contents will show the reader the large scope of the book, covering all of the eleven living religions of the world (Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, Sikhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Islam, Christianity). One of the most helpful and suggestive features of the book is found in the closing chapter, which contains a summary comparison of the living religions.

Nineteenth Century Evolution and After. A Study of Personal Forces Affecting the Social Process, in the Light of the Life-Sciences and Religion. By Reverend Marshall Dawson. Pages 145. Price \$1.50. The Macmillan Company, New York.

Where Evolution and Religion Meet. By John M. Coulter, Professor and Head of the Department of Botany at the University of Chicago, and Merle C. Coulter, Assistant Professor of Plant Genetics at the University of Chicago. Pages 105. Price \$1.25. The Macmillan Company, New York.

Two timely books on a controversial topic, coming from different sources. The first was written by a clergyman, and the second by scientists. But they both reach similar conclusions in regard to religion and evolution. Their verdict is that there is no contradiction between them. Rather, they complement one another. Moreover their verdict is written in such a manner that it will carry conviction to all men who can weigh facts recorded in plain English. There must be multitudes of men today, alarmed and disturbed in their faith by platform, pulpit, and press, to whom these little books would bring help and healing.

The Reverend Dawson calls his book "A Child of Anger and Love." Mayhap it was this anger (at man's stupidity?) put pepper and salt into his style. Anyway there is not a dull line in his book. Even his chapter-headings sound alluring—Growing a Backbone, Boneless Religion, Restudying Adam, etc. His purpose, he tells us, is to start the reader on the quest for a revised theory of his own nature. And he more than fulfils that promise. After properly demolishing ancient conceptions of man that have neither religious nor scientific foundations, he leaves the reader with a vision of himself that points to noble heights.

In "Where Evolution and Religion Meet" the reader will find an excellent statement of the true meaning of evolution in simple terms. The authors contend that much of the popular opposition to evolution rests upon ignorance or misunderstanding. And they provide a capital remedy for curable cases of that sort. First they present the evidences of evolution. Then, in five chapters, they explain and discuss

the various theories of evolution from Lamarck to the present. The final chapters discuss the Influence of the Evolution Idea and Evolution and Religion.

These two books deserve a wide reading. They will inspire preachers to speak wisely and helpfully on one of the vital issues of our time. They will help laymen of all kinds and classes to find the way that leads to a full reconciliation between science and religion.

BRIEF MENTION OF SIGNIFICANT BOOKS

The Expected Church. Twelve Sermons by M. S. Rice. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pages 216. Price \$1.50.

These sermons were preached in the Metropolitan Methodist Episcopal Church, Detroit, Michigan. Their central theme is the Church. They move on a high level of thought. Dr. Rice has the gift of simple speech and he understands the art of suggestive illustration. And he also has an intelligent conception of the place and power of the Church in our present life. His sermons deserve a wider audience than his congregation.

The New Greatness. By Frederick F. Shannon. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pages 148. Price \$1.25.

Twelve sermons from the pen of the Minister of Central Church, Chicago. Dr. Shannon has won a high place for himself in the esteem of his guild as a prophet with a vital message. This new volume of sermons on varied subjects will not diminish his reputation as a popular preacher in the high sense of that term. He understands his age and he also knows the gospel. And he has gained a rare efficiency in bringing these two face to face in thoughtful and colorful discourses.

Scouting and Religion. By the Reverend C. A. Guy, M.A. Late Commissioner for Rovers for Ceylon, and Chaplain of the Eighth Colombo Troop. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pages 86. Price .75 cts.

Talks to High School Boys. By John M. Holmes. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pages 162. Price \$1.50.

These two inexpensive books are filled with richly suggestive material for brief addresses to Boy Scouts and similar organizations. Their authors understand the difficult art of speaking effectively to the young. Their "Talks" are plain without being platitudinous, and simple without being obvious. There is an ever-growing audience of boys eager for inspiration and direction, and few there be who can face these keen and hungry lads without trepidation. A perusal of these books will prove richly rewarding to all who seek to help boys to become men.

One Hundred and One Hymn Stories. By Carl F. Price. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pages 112. Price .75 cts.

The story of one-hundred and one of our best hymns tersely told. The author deserves credit for his discriminating judgment in selecting these hymns from the vast stores of hymnology. From the first, "A Mighty Fortress is our God," to the last, "Where Cross the Crowded Ways of Life," not a trite hymn is included in his collection. Placed in the homes of Christian people, this little volume would be a distinctive aid to a deeper appreciation of the gems of religious poetry. Preachers will find it useful in the preparation of hymn-sermons.

Why I Believe In Religion. The Washington Gladden Lectures for the Year 1923. By Charles Reynolds Brown, Dean of the Divinity School, Yale University. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pages 175. Price \$1.50.

These lectures are the first series delivered on the "Washington Gladden Foundation," in the First Congregational Church of Columbus, Ohio. They are six in number, dealing with, The Belief in God, The Person of Christ, The Power of Atonement, The Value of Prayer, The Use of the Bible, The Hope of Future Life.

The loved and honored name of Washington Gladden

raises high expectations. The reader of Dean Brown's lectures will find that they are fully met in his book. It reveals his kinship of spirit with the one whose social passion and spiritual insight form one of the choicest traditions of our American Christianity.

Dean Brown's book was not written for scholars. It is wholly devoid of the jargon of the school. Its message is to the multitude of plain people who would fain find their way to the Christian foundations. It will gladden their heart, strengthen their faith, and enlist their energies in the cause of Christ. But the trained theologian will see in every lecture the landmarks of the author's wide scholarship and sound learning in the fundamentals of the Christian religion. Dr. Brown's manly "Credo" is bound to raise a swelling echo of glad assent among thoughtful readers.

The Virgin Birth. By Frederic Palmer, D.D., Harvard University. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pages 56. Price .75 cts.

The latest volume in the excellent series entitled "Little Books on Religion." The value of this slight volume is in inverse ratio to its size. It is truly "a temperate discussion of a subject now vexing and disturbing many loyal church people." Four brief chapters take up, The Biblical Evidence, The Growth of the Doctrine, Miracles, The Virgin Birth and the Creeds. The book is highly recommended to the clergy as well as to the laity. It will lead them to a quiet place, far from the din of theological strife, where faith in Christ rests secure on foundations that no man can shake.

THEO. F. HERMAN.